

ENGLAND V. ROME



H. B. SWETE

Class. ~~282~~ 280.20M

Book. SW46

General Theological Seminary Library.

Ninth Ave. and 20th St., New York.

Beside the main topic, this book also treats of

Subject No.

On page

Subject No.

On Page

PRESENTED BY

Rev. William H. Moore, D.D.

Rev Wm 16. Moore

Hempstead, L.I.

March 1874

ENGLAND VERSUS ROME

RIVINGTONS

London	<i>Waterloo Place</i>
Oxford	<i>High Street</i>
Cambridge	<i>Trinity Street</i>

ENGLAND VERSUS ROME

A BRIEF HAND-BOOK

OF THE

ROMAN CATHOLIC CONTROVERSY

For the use of Members of the English Church

BY

HENRY BARCLAY SWETE M A

FELLOW OF GONVILLE AND CAIUS COLLEGE CAMBRIDGE

ἀπ' ἀρχῆς δὲ οὐ γέγονεν οὕτως

RIVINGTONS

London Oxford and Cambridge

1868

280.20 M
S. W 46

22368

"She mourns that tender hearts should bend
Before a meaner shrine,
And upon Saint or Angel spend
The love that should be Thine."

NOTICE.

THE following pages lay no claim to originality. Their aim is to set before the non-theological reader a succinct account, historical and doctrinal, of the points at issue between the Churches of England and Rome. The views of both Churches have been expressed in the language of their own authoritative documents. Existing practices and current opinions are cited only so far as they serve to illustrate principles, or flow directly from them.

With the tenets of Protestant bodies external to the English Church this little book has no concern. It is an attempt to assert the Anglican position, and that alone.

Larger works of recognised merit have been freely used, but it has not been thought neces-

sary to refer to them except in cases of direct quotation, or where the reference seemed to be on other grounds desirable. Citations from patristic sources have been for the most part independently verified.

CAMBRIDGE,

Feast of All Saints, 1868.

CONTENTS.

	PAGES
CHAPTER I. OF SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION	1—19
§ i. Sufficiency of the Written Word.	3—8
§ ii. Interpretation of Scripture	8—14
§ iii. Canon of Scripture	14—19
CHAPTER II. OF ORIGINAL SIN.....	20—26
§ i. Removal of original Sin in Baptism	21—23
§ ii. Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin	23—26
CHAPTER III. OF JUSTIFICATION AND GOOD WORKS	27—43
§ i. Justification	29—39
§ ii. Good Works	39—43
CHAPTER IV. OF SUPREMACY AND IN- FALLIBILITY	44—70
§ i. Supremacy	47—65
§ ii. Infallibility	66—70
CHAPTER V. OF THE CONDITION OF THE FAITHFUL DEAD	71—84
CHAPTER VI. OF THE OBJECTS OF RE- LIGIOUS WORSHIP	85—120
§ i. Invocation of Saints	87—107
§ ii. Veneration of Relics	107—110
§ iii. Use of Images	110—120

	PAGES
CHAPTER VII. OF THE LANGUAGE OF COMMON PRAYER	121—129
CHAPTER VIII. OF THE NUMBER OF THE SACRAMENTS	130—135
CHAPTER IX. OF THE HOLY EUCHA- RIST	136—175
§ i. Transubstantiation	139—158
§ ii. Communion in both Kinds ...	158—163
§ iii. Eucharistic Sacrifice	163—175
CHAPTER X. OF PENANCE	176—196
CHAPTER XI. OF CLERICAL CELIBACY	197—203
CHAPTER XII. OF EXTREME UNCTION	204—208
APPENDIX	209—222
A. On the relation of the English Articles to the Council of Trent	209—210
B. Creed of Pius IV. and Bishop Jewel's Challenge	211—214
C. On Doctrinal Development ...	215—216
D. On English Orders	216—217
E. Lists of Fathers and Councils, and Indices	218—222

ENGLAND VERSUS ROME.

CHAPTER I.

OF SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION.

CHURCH OF ROME.

"Seeing clearly that this [saving] truth and [moral] discipline are contained in the written books and the unwritten traditions which, received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ Himself, or from the Apostles themselves, the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down even unto us, transmitted as it were from hand to hand; [the Synod] following the examples of the orthodox Fathers receives and venerates with an equal affection of piety and reverence all the books both of the Old and of the New Testament—seeing that one God is the author of both—as also the said traditions, as well those appertaining to Faith as to morals.

"Furthermore in order to restrain petulant spirits it decrees that no one relying on his own skill—in matters of faith and of morals pertaining to the edification of Chris-

CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein nor may be proved thereby is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the Faith."—Article VI.

"Blessed Lord, who hast caused all holy Scriptures to be written for our learning; Grant that we may in such wise hear them, read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest them, that by patience, and comfort of thy holy Word, we may embrace, and ever hold fast the blessed hope of everlasting life, which thou hast given us in our Saviour Jesus Christ."—Collect for 2nd Sund. in Advent (composed 1549).

"The three Creeds...ought thoroughly to be received and believed, for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture." Article VIII.

tian doctrine—wresting the Sacred Scripture to his own senses, presume to interpret the said Sacred Scripture contrary to that sense which holy mother Church—whose it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures—hath held and doth hold; or even contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers; even though such interpretations were never intended to be at any time published.”—Co. of Trent, Sess. IV.

“Every sort of doctrine which is to be delivered to the faithful is contained in the word of God, which is divided into Scripture and Tradition.”—Catech. of Co. of Trent (Preface, Q. xii.).

“It has thought it meet that a list of the sacred books be inserted in this decree lest a doubt may arise in any one’s mind which are the books that are received by this Synod. They are as set down here below: of the old Testament... [here follow the books received by the English Church, but mingled with them are also] Tobias, Judith, [the rest of] Esther, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus... Baruch... Daniel [including the song of the Three children, Story of Susanna and Bel and Dragon] and the two books of Maccabees. * * * But if any one receive not as Sacred and Canonical

[“The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in controversies of Faith: and yet] it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God’s word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, yet as it ought not to decree anything against the same: so besides the same ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation.” Article XX.

“Things ordained by them [General Councils] as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture.” Article XXI.

“It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, and utterly like; for at all times, they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men’s manners, so that nothing be ordained against God’s word. Whosoever through his private judgment, willingly and purposely, doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly, (that

¹ On the authority of this clause see Bp. Browne, *On Art. XX.*, or Hardwick, *Hist. of the Art.* p. 143.

the said books entire with all their parts as they have been used to be read in the Catholic Church and as they are contained in the Old Latin Vulgate edition; and knowingly and deliberately condemn the traditions aforesaid, let him be anathema.—Council of Trent, Sess. IX.

others may fear to do the like,) as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the Magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren.

“Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish, ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man’s authority, so that all things be done to edifying.”

“The other books (as Hierome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners, but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine; Such are these following: [Esdras iii. and iv.: Tobias: Judith: The rest of Esther: Wisdom: Ecclesiasticus: Baruch: Song of the Three Children: Story of Susanna: Bel and Dragon: Prayer of Manasses: Maccabees i. & ii.]

Several distinct questions are involved in this branch of the controversy. It will be convenient to treat them under the following sections: (1) The sufficiency of the Written Word, (2) The interpretation of Scripture (3) The Canon of the Old Testament.

§ i. *Sufficiency of the Written Word.*

1. Roman doctrine of a two-fold Word of God. The Roman Catholic Church holds that there is an unwritten word of God as well as a written: and that the two are of equal value and inspiration. The decree of the Council of Trent which established this

doctrine was not passed without opposition. One member of the Council hesitating to concede "equal reverence" to tradition as to Scripture, an unsuccessful attempt was made to substitute the word "similar" or "like." Another, the Bishop of Chioggia, warmly denounced the proposed formula as "impious¹." However the dissentients were outvoted by an overwhelming majority, and it was ruled (in the words of Bellarmine) that "besides the written word of God, there is need also of a word of God unwritten, namely the divine Apostolical traditions²."

2. **Anglican reply.** This decree was passed in 1546, and in 1552 it was answered by the English Church in the fifth of her first series of Forty-two Articles. She implicitly denied the existence of a traditionary revelation; and refused to acknowledge any court of final appeal in essentials of faith and practice excepting the written word. Things not laid down in Scripture might "be sometimes received of the faithful as godly, and profitable for order and comeliness;" but were in no case to be held necessary to salvation. The first book of Homilies labours to impress upon the people of England the conclusion at which the Church had arrived. "In Holy Scripture is *fully contained* what we ought to do and what to eschew, what to believe, what to love, and what to look for at God's hands at length." "There is no truth nor doctrine necessary for our justification and everlasting salvation but that is or may be drawn out of that fountain and well of truth³."

3. **Grounds of the Roman Catholic belief.** There is reason at first sight in the apology which the Tridentine Fathers offer for the authority of their un-

¹ Waterworth, p. lxxxviii.

² *De Verbo Dei non Scripto*, Op. I. p. 204.

³ *Hom.* bk. I. 1.

written Word. The teaching of our Lord and His Apostles, they argue¹, must be equally true and important, whether delivered in writing or by word of mouth. It is not essential to a revelation that it should be written: a genuine oral tradition is of the same authority as a genuine written record.

This is of course true enough. But the question remains, Is there good reason to believe that any genuine traditions survive—or indeed were ever delivered—*of such a nature as to contain essential doctrines or precepts which are not to be found in Holy Scripture*²?

It is answered, (a) That very many of our Lord's works and words were not recorded by the Evangelists (S. John xvi. 12; xxi. 25; Acts i. 3); (b) That the Apostles speak of "ordinances and traditions" which the Churches had been taught by word of mouth, (1 Cor. xi. 2; 2 Thess. ii. 15) and of a "deposit" of doctrine committed to the Christian Priesthood (1 Tim. vi. 20; 2 Tim. i. 13, 14. ii. 2)³.

¹ Sess. iv. (decree). Cf. Waterworth, p. lxxxviii.

² Cf. Usher: (*Answer to Challenge of a Jesuit*, p. 35.) "We willingly acknowledge that the word of God, which by some of the Apostles was set down in writing, was both by themselves and others of their fellow-labourers delivered by word of mouth, and that the Church in succeeding ages was bound not only to preserve those sacred writings...but also to deliver unto her children *vivâ voce* the form of wholesome words contained therein. Traditions therefore of this nature come not within the compass of our controversy....Again, it must be remembered that here we speak of the doctrine delivered as the *word of God*,...not of rites and ceremonies: traditions of this kind likewise are not properly brought within the circuit of this question."

³ It is also argued that in matter of fact some essentials of faith and practice, admitted to be such by ourselves, cannot be proved by Scripture alone: e.g. the observance of Sunday and of Infant Baptism: the canonicity of Scripture itself. The last point, however, rests not on any Apostolical tradition, but on the gradually-formed judgment of the post-

4. **Fallacy of the Roman Catholic Argument.**

But this answer comes short in two respects. It must be shewn (a) that *the oral teaching of Christ and His Apostles exceeded the limits of the written revelation* and (b) that *the existing traditions truly represent this oral teaching* as it came from the lips of inspiration. Now with regard to (b) it may be enough to urge the proverbial uncertainty of any report which has passed through the channel of many minds and mouths:

*"Mobilitate viget viresque acquirit eundo"*¹.

And as to (a) there is every reason for rejecting such a belief. For (1) Scripture asserts its own sufficiency, see e.g. 2 Tim. iii. 15—17; "The Holy Scriptures are able to make thee wise unto salvation... All Scripture is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." (2) It solemnly forbids any addition to the written word; "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it." Deut. iv. 2, cf. Apoc. xxii. 18. (3) It condemns in no measured terms the unwritten traditions of the Pharisees (S. Matt. xv. 3, 9; S. Mark vii. 7—13), which claimed to be a virtual supplement to the Canon of the Old Testament; and thus by anticipation and in principle it discourages the attempt to set up a body of traditions external to the Canon of the New². (4) The Roman doctrine of a supple-

Apostolic Church, exercising her office as "a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ." The two former observances may be derived from Scripture by fair logical inference.

¹ Virg. *Æn.* iv. 175. The infallibility of the Church may of course be pleaded here: but see Ch. iv. § 2.

² Dr Döllinger ingeniously urges (*First Age of the Church*, i. 221) that whilst our Lord rejected certain unauthorised traditions of the Jews, others were as distinctly adopted by

mentary tradition is an innovation. The testimony of the Fathers to the perfection of Scripture is most explicit. Let the following quotations serve as examples.

S. Irenæus.—"The scheme of our salvation we have come to know through no other persons than those by whom the Gospel was brought to us: which at the time they preached and afterwards by the will of God handed down to us in the Scriptures, to be the ground and pillar of our Faith¹."

Tertullian.—"Let the school of Hermogenes shew that it is written: if it is not written, let them fear the woe that is in store for those who add or take away²."

Origen.—"The two Testaments...in which every word which relates to God may be sought for and examined, and from which also all knowledge of (religious) facts may be obtained. Should, however, anything remain which Holy Scripture does not determine, no other third Scripture ought to be received as an authority for our knowledge³."

S. Athanasius.—"The holy and divinely inspired Scriptures are sufficient for the declaration of truth. These are the wells of salvation. In these alone is the doctrine of godliness taught⁴."

S. Basil.—"Believe those things which are written; things that are not written, seek not⁵."

Himself and His Apostles, and worked into the very fabric of Christianity. Possibly so: but traditions so authenticated stand on a widely different basis from those which rely merely upon the judgment of the post-Apostolic Church. Moreover, the Canon of Scripture being in our Lord's day incomplete, there was room for such accretions of revealed truth. Now, it is otherwise.

¹ *Adv. hæreses*, III. I.

² *Adv. Hermog.* c. 22.

³ *Hom.* v. in *Levit.*

⁴ *Contr. gentes*, I. I, and *Fest. Epist.* XXXIX.

⁵ *Hom.* XXIX.

S. Augustine.—"In the things which are plainly laid down in Scripture are found all things that embrace faith and practice¹." "Whatsoever ye hear from thence, let that savour well unto you: whatsoever is external to them [the Scriptures] reject, lest ye lose yourselves in a cloud²."

It is hardly possible to conceive of any statements more at variance with the Tridentine assertion "that all saving truth and moral discipline are contained in the written Books AND the unwritten Traditions," *these two together making up the whole Word of God*³. The early Church has left on record no uncertain verdict in favour of the sufficiency of the *written* Word.

§ ii. *The interpretation of Scripture.*

I. Anglican Use of Tradition.—The Church of England, in harmony with the primitive Catholic Church, rejects Tradition *as a guide of co-ordinate authority with Scripture*. But does she reject it

¹ *De doctr. Christianâ*, II. 9.

² *De pastor.* XI.

³ Roman Catholic writers have sometimes explained their doctrine of Tradition as a mere belief in the necessity of oral tradition to *expound* the written word: thus Newman (Letter on the *Eirenicon*, p. 14): "Roman Catholics mean that not every article is so contained (in Scripture) that it may thence be legally proved independently of the teaching and authority of tradition." So also Bellarmine: "all necessary doctrine is not contained *expressly* in Scripture." Such language, however, falls short of the Tridentine statement, which is after all the only authoritative expression of Roman doctrine. Moreover, when it comes to be reduced to practice it only means that any new article of faith or practice once maintained on the authority of Tradition may be afterwards wrung by the ingenuity of controversialists from passages of Scripture which would fail to render such an interpretation to the ordinary processes of exegesis.

altogether? Is the teaching which she has received from the earliest Christian ages valueless, because it is less than inspired?

Whatever answer may have been given to these questions by Protestant sectaries, such is not at any rate the Anglican belief. By the Articles of the English Church the sufficiency of Scripture is carefully limited to things essential to salvation (Art. VI). The power of interpreting the doctrines of Scripture is lodged in the hands of the Church, whose authority is in each case final, provided that her expositions do not contravene other passages of the written Word (xx). The Three Creeds, which are among the most notable traditions of antiquity, are “thoroughly to be believed and received,” since they are found to be in harmony with Scripture (VIII). Traditions which relate to ceremonies, though they may be modified or abolished by local Church authority, yet being once sanctioned by that authority are to be observed by all the members of the Church under a penalty of ecclesiastical censure (XXXIV).

These principles are practically illustrated in the English Prayer-book. The Preface complains that in the Mediæval Church “the godly and decent order of the Ancient Fathers had been altered, broken and neglected.” To Puritan objectors it replies that they “ought to have reverence unto Ancient Ceremonies for their antiquity.” In the same spirit, the Preface to the Ordinal appeals in favour of a three-fold ministry to “Ancient Authors,” as supplying testimony concurrent with that of Holy Scripture. The Prayer-book itself is compiled of materials drawn very largely from ancient sources, the whole body of Catholic antiquity, Eastern and Western, being laid under contribution for this purpose. Probably neither the Roman nor any other branch of the Church possesses a manual

of Public Offices so [thoroughly *catholic*, gathering up into itself so many different fragments of primitive devotion¹. The *Homilies* hold the same language with the Prayer-book. They abound in quotations from antiquity, refuting Roman innovations not only from Holy Scripture, but further, out of that which "was believed and taught of the old Holy Fathers and most ancient learned Doctors, and received in the old Primitive Church which was most uncorrupt and pure²". An example which the Church intended to be generally followed by her clergy; for the Convocation of 1571 decreed that "preachers take heed that they deliver nothing from the pulpit to be religiously held and believed by the people but that which is agreeable to the Old and New Testament, *and such as the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops have collected therefrom*³." In like manner the *Apology* of Bishop Jewel claims to "shew it plain that God's Holy Gospel, the ancient Bishops, and the Primitive Church do make on our side, and that we have not without cause left these men [the Romanists], and rather have returned to the Apostles *and old Catholic fathers*⁴."

Lastly, the same language has been held by all the great lights of the Anglican Communion. Bishop Kaye has well summed up the views of the English Reformers, as well as of later English divines, in the following words: "Nothing was more remote from their intention than indiscriminately to condemn all Tradition. They knew that, as far as external evi-

¹ For a good popular guide to the sources from which the Prayer-book is drawn, the reader is referred to Messrs. Campion and Beamont's *Prayer-book Interleaved*; Rivingtons, 1866.

² *Hom.* bk. II. 2, pt. 2.

³ Cardwell, *Synod.* I. p. 126.

⁴ *Apology* (ed. Parker Soc.), p. 56.

dence is concerned, the tradition preserved in the Church is the only ground on which the genuineness of the Books of Scripture can be established..... What our Reformers opposed was the notion that men must, upon the mere authority of tradition, receive as necessary to salvation doctrines not contained in Scripture¹."

To sum up, The Church of England receives no article of faith or essential rule of practice on the sole authority of tradition ; but she attaches due weight to primitive tradition as an interpreter of Scripture, and this in two respects ; (1) *in matters of ceremony*. Scripture directs in general terms, " Let all things be done decently and in order." But Tradition steps in as a historical witness to the manner in which the Apostolic Churches carried out this general rule ; and the Church of England shapes her worship accordingly, regard being had to altered circumstances and times. (2) *In cases of doubtful construction*. Here the prevailing belief of the ages nearest to the sources of inspiration, and the decisions of General Councils composed of holy and learned Bishops gathered from every part of the Christian world, justly claim (in the belief of the English Church) the deepest respect which is consistent with the fallibility of all human testimony. Thus, where Holy Scripture has laid down no express rule of practice, the Anglican principle is that of the 1st Council of Nicæa, τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατεῖτω, " Let primitive customs be maintained²." And where, in spite of all exegetical appliances, the doctrine and teaching of Holy Scripture remain ambiguous, we hold by Tertullian's canon, " id esse verum quodcunque primum ; id esse adulterum, quod-

¹ Kaye, *Tertullian*, p. 297.

² Conc. Nicæn. *Can.* vi.

cunque posterius." "The earliest is genuine; the later spurious¹."

2. Private Judgment in the English Church.—

From the above it will be seen how far and in what sense the Church of England encourages "private judgment." She does not send each of her members to the Bible, to form his religion out of the Scriptures as best he may; but she invites him to test the doctrine which he has received at her hands by the Word of God. The conscience is to be the final judge² as to the agreement of the traditional faith with the written Word; and only so far as they shall be found to agree is the conscience bound to yield assent to the Church's dictum. But, on the other hand, it is the duty of every individual member of the Church who thinks it needful to exercise this right, to prepare himself for the work by prayer, by honest comparison of Scripture with Scripture, by the help of grammatical aids and the advice of learned and pious men; and finally, if after such an examination Holy Scripture is not found to contradict the teaching of the Church, he must submit to her teaching as to the decision of a faithful witness and keeper of God's Holy Word³.

The Roman Catholic Church, on the contrary, ignores the rights of the individual conscience. The *ultimate* responsibility of decision rests not with the individual, but with the Church. There is no appeal from her verdict to the court of Scripture.

3. Practical Results of Anglican and Roman Views. The practical result of the Roman Catholic

¹ *Adv, Prax.* I.

² This is surely implied in the clause of Article XX. which limits the defining power of the Church by the rule of Holy Scripture. For how, but by the conscience of individual Christians, can that rule be applied to the Church's decisions?

³ On the question of Infallibility see chap. IV. § 2.

system is the *substitution* of the teaching of the Church for the reading of Holy Scripture. If the Church's teaching is the perfect and infallible reflection of Scripture, what need for the laity to investigate the original documents on which it is founded? Nay, such an investigation may be dangerous; it may tend to unsettle the minds of men, and to re-open questions that have been set at rest for ever. Hence, though the Church of Rome has never formally denounced the general reading of Scripture, she has in almost all cases, and with much general success, discouraged it. Thus Pius IV. (*Index of Prohibited Books*, 1564) forbade the reading of Holy Scripture in the vulgar tongue without a special licence from the bishop; adding, "It is manifest from experience that if the Holy Bible be read everywhere in the vulgar tongue more harm than good arises therefrom, owing to men's rashness." Again, Clement XI. (in 1713) condemned as scandalous, pernicious, and impious the proposition that "the reading of Holy Scripture is for all." In "heretical" countries indeed (as England and Ireland), some licence has been allowed in the use of the translated Scriptures¹, because public opinion requires the concession: but the natural result of the Roman doctrine may be seen in the almost utter banishment of the Word of God from the houses of the common people in the chief strongholds of Roman Catholicism, as Belgium and Spain and Rome itself. It cannot be pleaded that the opposition of the Roman Church is directed only against Protestant versions of the Scriptures; because of course it is perfectly open to the authorities to circulate a version of their own. In order to exhibit the tendency of the two systems, Anglican and Roman, it is enough to ask in which of

¹ Dens, *Theol. de Virt. N. 64*, tom. II. p. 103.

the two communions the Holy Scriptures are most generally studied and most familiarly known to the laity ; or, in other words, to which of the two does the encomium which S. Luke pronounced on the Berean Jews most justly belong, "These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so"?

§ iii. *The Canon of the Old Testament.*

1. **Nature of the Dispute.** With regard to the number of the books which form the New Testament there is no disagreement between the Churches ; but into the canon of the Old Testament the Roman Church admits eleven books or fragments of books, which the Church of England relegates (together with three others of a somewhat similar character) to a second class, as writings of inferior authority.

2. **Meaning of the word Canon.** The Greek word, *κανών*, *rule*¹, does not seem to have been

¹ "The word Canon ['reed,' Engl. *cane*]...is connected with a large class of derivatives (canal, channel, cannon) in which the idea of 'straightness' prevails. *Canōn* itself, which is a classical Greek term, signifies properly a *straight rod*, especially a *carpenter's rule*. Thus the word came to be used for the *standard* in art and literature and morals. At the same time it was used also *passively* for that which was definitely measured (comp. 2 Cor. x. 13—16).

In the first three centuries the word is not used of the Scriptures, but of the traditional *Rule* of the Church,...specially of the *Creed* in which that law was embodied....The first application of the word to Scripture is in the derivatives *canonize* and *canonical*....And the first meaning of *canonical* was in all probability passive, 'admitted by rule,' and not (as at a later time) 'giving the rule.'

The chief point of interest to be observed in these fluctuating meanings of the terms is that the *verb* and not the *substantive* is first applied to the Bible. That was first tried by

applied to the volumes of Holy Scripture before the end of the fourth century. A century earlier, however, certain sacred writings had been described as *canonical* or *canonized*, i. e. admitted by the rule of the Church's judgment into the number of inspired books¹; or possibly as themselves being the infallible rule of faith².

3. Formation of the Old Testament Canon.

In the case of the Old Testament, the canon had been practically formed before the books passed into the hands of the Church. To the Jews "were committed the oracles of God," and to them belonged the work of collecting and delivering to future ages these divine treasures. From the Jews accordingly the Christian Church received the Old Testament Scriptures; but she received them in two forms, differing both in language and extent. The *Hebrew canon* contained none but the books which are described as Scriptures of the Old Testament by the sixth Article of the English Church. No other books are quoted as canonical by our Lord and His Apostles³. No other books were acknowledged by the Jews of Palestine⁴. On the other hand, the *Alexandrian Greek Version*, (or Septuagint), as it was known to the fathers of the Church, contained sundry other documents which had been incorporated into the body of the work, and thus virtually claimed to rank side by side with the Hebrew Scriptures. Unhappily, from their igno-

a rule and ratified, which afterwards became itself the rule." Westcott, *The Bible in the Church*, p. 110, note.

¹ Mr Westcott's view; see preceding note.

² Bp. Cosin's *Scholast. Hist. of Canon*, ch. i.

³ On some supposed quotations of the Apocrypha in the New Testament see Westcott, *Bible in the Church*, p. 45 (note).

⁴ e.g. Josephus, whose evidence is quoted by Eusebius, *H. E.* III. 9.

rance of the Hebrew language, the early Christian writers were almost wholly confined to the Septuagint or to versions founded upon it. It is not surprising, therefore, that they should have quoted the Apocryphal books as Scripture equally with the truly canonical¹. Nevertheless, the truth with regard to the extent of the Hebrew canon was gradually brought to light and recognised. Origen, who was acquainted with Hebrew, writes (*in Psalm i.*) "It is not to be forgotten that the books which compose the Old Testament as the Hebrews deliver them to us, are *two and twenty*."² Again, those of the fathers who were brought into contact with Palestine and the East, learnt to regard with suspicion the books which were unknown to the Hebrew canon. Melito, Bishop of Sardis (160), obtained from the East a list which exactly agrees with our own. S. Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, recommends to the Catechumens the *twenty-two* books of the Old Testament. S. Athanasius of Alexandria, S. Epiphanius of Cyprus, S. Chrysostom of Constantinople, acknowledge as Divine Scripture none but the Hebrew canon; S. Chrysostom expressly saying³ "All the Divine books of the Old Testament were originally composed in the Hebrew tongue. This all would be ready to grant." Lastly, S. Jerome [Hieronymus, or "Hierome"] whose testimony is in part quoted in Article VI., not only confirms this limitation of the Old Testament, but distinctly states that "*whatever lies beyond the pale of these* [the books of the Hebrew

¹ Even the Anglican Homilies appear to do the same, *e.g.* b. II. xi. 2; cf. *Tracts for the Times*, xc. p. 78 (ed. Pusey).

² The Hebrew (or present Anglican) canon was commonly divided into 22, sometimes into 24 books.

³ *Hom. in Gen.* III.

canon] is to be placed among the Apocryphal writings¹."

On the other hand the great name of S. Augustine is urged in support of the Roman canon. In a list of canonical books (supplied in his treatise *On Christian Doctrine*, II. 8) he includes Tobit, Judith, Maccabees i. and ii., Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus². Moreover he was present at the Council of Carthage (397) which accepted these books as Holy Scripture. S. Augustine however has elsewhere made it plain that he did not regard the Greek books with the same veneration as the Hebrew Canon. Thus he says that "the History of the Maccabees is not found in the Sacred Scriptures which are called canonical but amongst others which are held canonical not by the Jews but by the Church³," and again, "The Jews have them not like the Psalms and the prophets to which the Lord gave His witness⁴." And notwithstanding the reputation of his authority, there is extant a long series of Catholic writers from the 6th to the 16th century⁵ who hold fast to the decision of Jerome.

¹ The authority of the Laodicean Canon has not been urged, because the weight of evidence seems to lie against the genuineness of its catalogue. There is no doubt, however, that this list, which excludes the Apocrypha, is of early origin. See Westcott, *Bible in the Church*, p. 170.

² S. Augustine's language, however, is by no means decided. He recommends the student "in judging of the Canonical Scriptures" to "follow the authority of as many Catholic Churches as possible," preferring those books "which are received by all Catholic Churches to those which some do not receive;" and then he supplies the list to which reference has been made. It is to be remembered that S. Augustine as a Latin Father had but little critical aptitude for settling the Canon of the Old Testament.

³ *De Civ.* XVIII. 36.

⁴ *Contr. Gaudent.* II.

⁵ Among them are S. Gregory the Great (Cent. VII),

4. **Tridentine Decision.** So the case stood until for the Latin Communion the controversy was decided by a majority of the Tridentine Fathers. Ignoring the opinions of early writers eminent for their learning and piety, and the belief of the orthodox Eastern Branch of the Catholic Church: ignoring also the fact that the additional books were confessedly wanting in the Canon which our Lord Himself received and acknowledged, the Council not only admitted these books to an authority absolutely equal with that of the undoubted word of God, but anathematised all persons who should venture to hold the contrary opinion¹.

It is but fair to add that some eminent Romanists have sought to modify the severity of the Tridentine decree: Du Pin, for instance, was willing to accept for the Apocryphal books the title "Deutero-Canonical²." In making this admission however there is little doubt that (if it is to be regarded as of any real worth) he was contravening the plain language of the Council and exposing himself to its anathema.

5. **Anglican use of the "Apocrypha³."** A word S. John Damascene (VIII), Nicephorus (IX), Hugo of S. Victor (XII).

¹ "This fatal decree, in which the Council, harassed by the fear of lay critics and 'grammarians,' gave a new aspect to the whole question of the Canon, was ratified by 53 prelates, among whom there was not one German, not one scholar distinguished for historical learning, not one who was fitted by special study for the examination of a subject in which truth could only be determined by the voice of antiquity." Westcott, *Bible in the Church*, p. 257.

² Pusey, *Eirenicon*, p. 217.

³ The term *Apocrypha* ["secret" = "spurious" writings] has been employed throughout this section in conformity with modern usage and the authority of S. Jerome. It belongs more properly to the forged books of heretics: "ecclesiastical" or "disputed" is the usual title of the uncanonical books in the writings of the Fathers.

must be said as to the Anglican use of the Apocryphal writings. The Church of England, after ejecting these books from the Canon, does not proceed with some bodies of Protestants to eject them from the office of teaching. If the Apocryphal books cannot establish doctrine, they can and do teach much salutary truth. As forming a link of connection between the Old and New Testaments; as composed by men whose style of thought and feeling was cast in the mould of the Old Testament Scriptures; as the product of an age in which it may have been that the last throbbings of inspiration were not yet extinct: finally, as accepted in this lower sense by the judgment of the whole Primitive Church of Christ, the Ecclesiastical or Apocryphal books are still by the English Church deemed worthy of study and regard. Whether our Reformers acted wisely in retaining them in the public lectionary of the Church, may perhaps be matter of opinion even among loyal members of the Anglican Communion; that they were right in not expelling them altogether from the catalogue of sacred books cannot be questioned. The Church of England does but speak the language of the purest Christian times, when with S. Athanasius she says of her present canon, "These are the wells of salvation; in these alone is the doctrine of godliness taught¹:" and yet holds with S. Epiphanius, "that the ecclesiastical books are useful and of profit though they fall not within the number of the Canonical²."

¹ *Fest. Ep.* xxxix.

² *De Mensuris*, p. 162.

CHAPTER II.

OF ORIGINAL SIN.

CHURCH OF ROME.

"If any one...asserts that [by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ which is conferred in Baptism] the whole of that which has the true and proper nature of sin is not taken away but says that it is only cancelled or not imputed; let him be anathema...This Holy Synod confesses and is sensible that in the baptized there remains concupiscence or an incentive to sin...This concupiscence, which the Apostle sometimes calls sin, the Holy Synod declares that the Catholic Church has never understood to be called sin, as being truly and properly sin in those born again, but because it is of sin and inclines to sin; and if any one is of a contrary sentiment let him be anathema. This same Holy Synod doth nevertheless declare that it is not its intention to include in this decree, where original sin is treated of, the blessed and immaculate Virgin Mary the mother

CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

"This infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerated; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in Greek, phronema sarkos, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire, of the flesh, is not subject to the Law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, yet the Apostle doth confess, that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin." Article IX.

"We must trust only in God's mercy and in that Sacrifice which...the Son of God once offered for us on the Cross to obtain thereby God's grace and remission as well of our original sin in Baptism as of all actual sin committed by us after our Baptism." Homily of Salvation¹, § 2.

"It is certain by God's word that children which are baptized, dying before they commit

¹ On the authoritative character of this Homily see Chap. III.

of God; but that the constitutions of Pope Sixtus IV. of happy memory are to be observed."—Co. of Trent. Sess. V.

"The most Blessed Virgin Mary was in the first instant of her conception preserved free from all original sin by the singular grace and privilege of Almighty God in view of the merits of Christ Jesus the Saviour of mankind." Decree of Pius IX. (A. D. 1854.)

actual sin, are undoubtedly saved." Office for Public Baptism.

"Christ in the truth of our nature was made like unto us in all things, sin only except, from which he was clearly void, both in his flesh, and in his spirit....But all we the rest, although baptized, and born again in Christ, yet offend in many things; and if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." Article XV.

Under this head there are two points of differences, the first, perhaps chiefly verbal: the second, of importance in many points of view. These relate to

- (1) The removal of Original Sin in Baptism.
- (2) The Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

§ i. Removal of Original Sin in Baptism.

1. **Statement of Difference.** The English Church teaches that one effect of Baptism in the case of believing adults and of all infants who die before they commit actual sin is to remit the *condemnation* attaching to original sin. The Church of Rome adds that the *infection* of original sin is also removed; for the concupiscence which remains in the regenerate or baptized is not in itself sinful, although it tends to sin and practically issues in acts of sin.

2. **Grounds of the Anglican View.** The Council of Trent confesses that S. Paul calls concupiscence

sin (Rom. vii. 7). But it proceeds to explain that sin is here equivalent to that which comes from sin and leads to sin. Our Anglican divines preferred to adhere to the plain teaching of the Apostle's words. A tendency to sin, they reasonably thought, is in itself the symptom of spiritual disease; that which is the parent of all human sin (S. James i. 14, 15) cannot itself be free from the nature of sin¹.

The Tridentine view seems in fact to rest upon an imperfect theory of original sin. From the history of the Council² it appears that the proposition that "original sin is a corruption of the whole man in his will soul and body," was tolerated only on the understanding that this corruption is *solely privative*. It would seem as if the Synod, though it shrank from giving an exact definition of original sin, inclined toward the view of the Schoolmen, who taught that original sin is simply the loss of original righteousness, a negative rather than a positive evil, a defect rather than a fault. This defect was thought to be sufficiently supplied by the justifying grace of Baptism, and hence the assertion of the Council that Baptism eliminates the sin as well as the condemnation which is derived from Adam.

But such a view of original sin appears to fall far short of the teaching of Holy Scripture. Scripture describes human nature, in so far as it is unrenewed, as "corrupt according to the deceitful lusts" (Eph. iv. 22), "enmity against God" (Rom. viii. 7), "evil from [its] youth" (Gen. viii. 21); and though it exempts from *condemnation* those that believe and are baptized

¹ Dr Pusey thinks that the English Reformers were perfectly at one with the Council on this point (*Eirenicon*, p. 18, and note). Bp. Forbes holds the same view (*Articles*, I. p. 150). The reader will be able to form his own judgment from the documents laid before him on p. 20.

² Sarpi (*transl. Brent*), p. 175.

(S. Mark xvi. 16), it nowhere exempts them from the workings of moral *corruption*. On the contrary, it holds that in the regenerate "the flesh lusteth against the Spirit;" that the law of sin is yet in their members, even after they have been enabled by the Spirit of Christ to serve the law of God.

§ ii. *Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin.*

I. **Disputed Statement of S. Augustine.** The origin of this dogma is commonly traced to a saying of S. Augustine (*de natura et gratia contr. Pelagium*, c. XLII). The Bishop of Hippo had given a list of saints who, from a Pelagian point of view, had lived sinless lives, ending with "the mother of our Lord and Saviour, who must be confessed to have been without sin." Augustine fancies he can hear them all reply in the words of the Apostle John, "If we say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves." But he allows the last-named to be a possible exception. "Of Saint Mary the Virgin, for the honour of our Lord, I would raise no questions when the subject of sin is under consideration. How know we what abundance of grace may have been vouchsafed to her to overcome all sin—to her who was chosen to conceive and bring forth Him who knew no sin?"

It is to be observed, however, (1) that S. Augustine leaves the sinlessness of the Blessed Virgin an open question, and (2) that at the most he would exempt her from the charge only of actual, not of original, sin; nay his words seem to contain a virtual denial of her immaculate conception; for it is difficult to see how a being free from all tendency to sin could need an extraordinary supply of grace to overcome it. Certainly such language could not be used with regard to our Blessed Lord's victories over the evil one.

At any rate S. Augustine's teaching at other times flatly contradicts such a speculation, *e.g.* in his treatise *On the Deserts and Remission of Sin* (II. 57), he writes "Let us then hold fast this confession of faith. There was but One only¹ who was born without sin in the likeness of sinful flesh." The other Fathers are here in perfect agreement with him; witness *S. Clement* of Alexandria: "The Word alone is without sin, for to sin is natural and common to all¹." *S. Ambrose*: "None is without sin; to deny this is sacrilege²." *S. Cyril* of Alexandria: "Christ was the first and only human being upon earth who did no sin³." Indeed, SS. Athanasius and Chrysostom expressly impute sin to the Blessed Virgin Mary, interpreting our Lord's words in S. John ii. 4 as a direct reproof.

2. **Mediæval Opinion.** Even the middle ages did not venture to assert the sinless conception of the Blessed Virgin. *S. Anselm*, Archbishop of Canterbury, though he believed that Mary was purified from all sin before the birth of her Son, distinctly teaches⁴ "that the Virgin from whom He was taken was conceived in iniquities and born with original sin." *S. Bernard*, again, in a letter⁵ to the Canons of Lyons, in which he strongly opposes the introduction of a new festival in honour of "the Conception of S. Mary," argues thus: "Although it has been given to some few of the sons of men to be *born* in a state of sanctification" (he instances *Jeremiah* and *S. John Baptist*), "yet to be *conceived* in the like manner has been granted to none, that the privilege of a holy conception might be reserved for Him Who was to sanctify all and Who, alone coming into the world

¹ *Pædagog.* I. 3.

⁴ *Cur Deus Homo*, II. xvi.

² *In Ps.* cxviii.

⁵ *Epist.* CLXXIV.

³ *De rectâ fide ad Theodos.*

without sin, was to make expiation for the sins of men. Excepting only Him, the Psalmist's language applies to all the other sons of Adam, when he humbly and truthfully confesses for himself, 'I was born in iniquities, and in sin did my mother conceive me.'" Similarly *Thomas Aquinas*¹, after an elaborate discussion under six heads, concludes that the Blessed Virgin, though sanctified before her birth and afterwards preserved from actual sin, was nevertheless not sanctified till after animation, and retained in herself up to the time of our Lord's conception the incentives of sin—in other words, that she was not immaculately conceived in the same sense as her Son.

On the other hand, the yearly Festival of the Conception continued to cherish a belief in the opposite direction. At length *Duns Scotus* openly espoused the cause of S. Mary's perfect sinlessness, and was followed by the whole order of the Franciscans, to whom he belonged. The Council of Basle, in 1439², ventured so far as to declare the doctrine that the Virgin was never actually subject to original sin "agreeable to the Catholic faith, to reason, and to Holy Scripture." Fifty years after, Pope Sixtus IV. attempted to close the discussion by pronouncing excommunication against all who should either deny the doctrine on the one hand, or on the other denounce its denial as a heresy. At the Council of Trent (1546) the Franciscans who were present wished to except the "Virgin Mother of God" from the decree on original sin; the Dominicans, however, successfully opposed them; a clause which formulized the Immaculate Conception was lost by a small majority; and eventually the Fathers contented themselves with renewing the constitutions of Sixtus IV.

¹ *S. Theol.* III. Q. XXVII.

² *Concil.* XII. 622.

3. **Recent Decree of the Roman See.** Thus it was reserved for the nineteenth century to witness the erection by the Roman Church of this quasi-heretical opinion into an essential truth of the Catholic faith. Without any pretence of sanction from Holy Scripture, against the explicit testimonies of early Fathers, the decision of some of the chief mediæval authorities, and the earnest expostulations of a large minority of living Roman Catholic¹ Bishops, the present Pope has bound upon the conscience of Roman Christendom a dogma which attributes to the human Mother of our Lord an honour hitherto believed to have been the peculiar property of the Incarnate Son.

¹ The adverse opinion of Thomas Aquinas, it seems, staggered more than one of the Bishops to whom Pius IX. applied for opinions on the propriety of decreeing the Immaculate Conception as *de fide*. See Dr Pusey's *Eirenicon*, Appendix B. p. 396, and cf. pp. 127—137. It appears that the Roman Catholic Bishops of France Germany and the United States were to a very considerable extent adverse to the measure, or lukewarm about it.

CHAPTER III.

OF JUSTIFICATION AND GOOD WORKS.

CHURCH OF ROME.

"Justification ... is not remission of sins merely, but also the sanctification and renewal of the inward man."

"The alone formal cause [of justification] is the justice of God, not that whereby He Himself is just, but that whereby He maketh us just, that, to wit, with which we being endowed by Him, are renewed in the spirit of our mind, and we are not only reputed, but are truly called and are just, receiving justice within us."

"Faith, unless hope and charity be added thereto, neither unites man perfectly with Christ, nor makes him a living member of His Body."

"Whereas Jesus Christ Himself constantly infuses His virtue into the said justified... and this virtue always precedes and accompanies and

CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

"We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by Faith, and not for our own works or deservings: Wherefore, that we are justified by Faith only is a most wholesome Doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification."—Article XI.

"Infants being baptized and dying in their infancy are by this sacrifice [of Christ] washed from their sins, brought to God's favour and made His children and inheritors of His kingdom of Heaven. And they which in act or deed do sin after their Baptism, when they turn again to God unfeignedly, they are likewise washed by this sacrifice from their sins in such sort that there re-

follows their good works, which without it could not in any wise be pleasing and meritorious before God; we must believe that nothing further is wanting to the justified, to prevent their being accounted to have, by those very works which have been done in God, fully satisfied the Divine law, according to the state of this life, and to have truly merited eternal life...if so be, however, that they depart in grace.”—Co. of Trent, Sess. VI. ch. vii. xvi.

“If any one saith that by faith alone the impious is justified; in such wise as to mean, that nothing else is required to cooperate in order to the obtaining of the grace of justification.....If any one saith that men are justified either by the sole imputation of the justice of Christ, or by the sole remission of sins, to the exclusion of the grace and the charity which is poured forth in their hearts by the Holy Ghost and is inherent in them If any one saith that the justice received is not preserved and also increased before God through good works.....If any one saith that the good works of one that is justified are in such manner the gifts of God, as that they are not also the good merits of him that is justified: or that the said justified, by the good works which he performs through the grace of God and the merit of Jesus Christ, Whose living member

maineth not any spot of sin that shall be imputed to their damnation. This is that justification or righteousness which S. Paul speaketh of when he saith, No man is justified by the works of the law, but freely by faith in Jesus Christ.”—Homily of Salvation, § I.

“Albeit that good Works, which are the fruits of Faith, and follow after Justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God’s Judgement; yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively Faith; insomuch that by them a lively Faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit.”—Article XII.

“[A true and lively] faith doth not shut out repentance, hope, love, dread, and the fear of God, to be joined with faith in every man that is justified; but it shutteth them out from the office of justifying. So that though they be all present together in him that is justified, yet they justify not all together. Neither doth faith shut out the justice of our good works, necessarily to be done afterward of duty towards God...but it excludeth them so, that we may not do them to this intent to be made just by doing of them...Faith which bringeth forth without repentance either evil works or no good works, is not a right, pure, and lively faith, but a

he is, does not truly merit increase of grace, eternal life, and the attainment of that eternal life, if so be however that he depart in grace, and also an increase of glory..... Let him be anathema."—Co. of Trent, Sess. VI. Canons ix, xi, xxiv, xxxii.

dead, devilish, counterfeit and feigned faith, as SS. Paul and James call it."—Homily of Salvation, §§ 1 and 3.

"Voluntary Works besides, over and above, God's Commandments, which they call Works of Supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety: for by them men do declare, that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake, than of bounden duty is required: whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded to you, say, We are unprofitable servants."—Article XIV.

§ i. Of Justification.

1. Points of Difference: any, and if so what?

An eminent living authority in the Anglican Church has lately written: "I believe that we [England and Rome] have the same doctrine of Grace and of Justification. There is not one statement in the elaborate chapters on Justification in the Council of Trent which any of us could fail of receiving; nor is there one of their anathemas on the subject, which in the least rejects any statement of the Church of England¹."

In weighing this opinion it is to be remarked, in the first place, that both the Churches have expressed their judgments on Justification with more than usual deliberation and diffuseness. The Council of Trent

¹ Dr Pusey, *Eirenicon*, p. 19. Cf. Tract xc. (ed. Pusey), pp. 12—14.

was engaged for some six months on the subject: on each item in the Decree the sentiments of the Fathers present were taken individually; the draught was recast several times before it was finally submitted to the vote, and the amended form was adopted with almost perfect unanimity¹. The length of the Decree and the number of Canons which follow it (33) testify—if further testimony is wanting—to the great importance which was attached to this question, and to the care expended upon it. And the earnestness of the Tridentine Fathers seems to have been fully reciprocated by the English Reformers. In treating of the doctrine of Justification, they departed from their principle of expressing the Church's belief on each subject in a single brief article, and referred her members to the longer and more popular exposition which had been given in one of the then recent Homilies. It is evident that by both Communions the question was viewed as one of vital interest; nor is it likely that any marked differences of expression in the two statements are due to hasty or inaccurate writing. Yet several such differences will become apparent to any one who will be at the pains to compare the documents cited at the head of this chapter. It is indeed thankfully acknowledged that the Church of Rome holds, in common with ourselves, (1) the impossibility of being justified by natural goodness or by the works of the Mosaic law²; (2) the necessity of prevenient grace to produce faith, hope, love, and penitence³; (3) that our Lord JESUS Christ is the meritorious cause of our justification⁴; (4) that faith is the beginning of human salvation, the foundation and root of all justification,

¹ Waterworth, p. cix.

² Council of Trent, *Sess.* VI. Canon 1, 2.

³ Canon 3.

⁴ Canon 10.

so that without faith no man was ever justified¹. But can it be doubted that she holds also what we deny, *viz.* (1) that to justify is not simply to account righteous, but also to infuse righteousness; and (2) that no man was ever justified by faith alone?

2. **Meaning of Justification.** It is of little consequence whether justification is represented as an *act* of acquittal on the part of God, or as a *state* of acceptance consequent on acquittal. But it is by no means immaterial whether our acceptance with God depends upon the righteousness of Christ, or upon our own: whether the holiness which, it is agreed, the grace of God infuses into the justified², is the *cause*, or simply the *effect* and fruit of our justification. Here, then, the two Churches join issue. "We disagree (says Hooker) about the nature of the very essence of the medicine whereby Christ cureth our disease. . . . When they are required to shew what the righteousness is whereby a Christian man is justified, they answer that it is a divine spiritual quality, which quality received into the soul doth (first) make it to be one of them that are

¹ Ibid. *Decr.* c. VII., VIII.

² It is usual with the opponents of the doctrine of imputed righteousness to represent it as immoral, at least in its tendencies. Thus Döllinger (*Church and the Churches*, p. 174) speaks of certain of its supporters as affirming that a man may be "received by God as righteous though inwardly he is not so"—*i. e.* that the imputation of righteousness may take place without the infusion. As far as the English Church is concerned the XIIth Article is a sufficient answer; it is worthy of notice, however, that both the objection and the answer are as old as Christianity (Rom. vi. 1—15). Dr Döllinger is also triumphant at the general denial of the doctrine by the eminent theologians of modern Germany (p. 295). But if modern German opinion is to be the rule of orthodoxy, the Church will presently lose not a few landmarks of faith which Rome as well as England has hitherto endeavoured to maintain.

born of God, and (secondly) endue it with power to bring forth such works as they do that are born of Him¹." In other words, the Justification of the Tridentine divines is equivalent to *regeneration* and *sanc-tification*; its first stage consists of the new birth; it is capable of continual increase by the merit of good works, and of reparation when it decays by the 'Sacrament' of Penance.

3. **Comparison of the Tridentine Doctrine with Holy Scripture.** On the unscriptural character of this view let us again hear the 'judicious' Hooker. "I will set (he continues) a frame of Apostolical erection by it in few words, that it may befall Babylon in presence of that which God builded, as it happened unto Dagon before the Ark. 'Doubtless,' saith the Apostle, 'I have counted all things loss, and I do judge them to be dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in Him, not having mine own righteousness but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God through faith.' Whether they speak of the first or second justification, they make the essence of it a quality inherent, they make it righteousness which is in us. If it be in us, then it is ours, as our souls are ours though we have them from God but the righteousness wherein we must be found if we will be justified is not our own; therefore we cannot be justified by any inherent quality. Christ hath merited righteousness for as many as are found in Him. In Him God findeth us, if we be faithful; for by faith we are incorporated into Him. Then although in ourselves we be altogether sinful and unrighteous, yet even the man which in himself is impious, full of iniquity, full of sin—him being found in Christ through faith and having his sin in hatred through repentance—

¹ *Serm. on Justification*, § 4.

him God beholdeth with a gracious eye, putteth away his sin by not imputing it, taketh quite away the punishment due thereunto by pardoning it; and accepteth him in JESUS Christ as perfectly righteous as if he had fulfilled all that is commanded him in the law; shall I say, more perfectly righteous than if himself had fulfilled the whole law? I must take heed what I say: but the Apostle saith 'God made Him Which knew no sin to be sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him.' Such we are in the sight of God the Father, as is the very Son of God Himself. Let it be counted folly, or phrensy, or fury, or whatsoever. It is our wisdom and our comfort; we care for no knowledge in the world but this, that man hath sinned and God hath suffered; that God hath made Himself the sin of men, and that men are made the righteousness of God¹."

Let the reader place this specimen of truly Anglican teaching and the opposite doctrine of Trent side by side with S. Paul's testimony in Romans iv. 1—8, 22—25, v. 12—21, viii. 33, 34; Galatians ii. 15, 16, iii. 6—9; Titus iii. 4, 5: and let him then judge for himself which of the two most nearly reflects the mind of the Spirit of God.

4. **Comparison of the Tridentine Doctrine with the Judgment of Antiquity.** On the question of Justification the ancient Church has said but little. Doctrines are not usually defined or stated with formal accuracy until some heresy arises to call forth the expression of the Church's mind. Now the heresies of the earlier ages centred almost exclusively round the Person of our Lord; the subjective work of Grace had not yet become the chief field of controversy; theories of Justification therefore belong to the 16th rather than

¹ *Serm. on Justification*, §§ 5, 6.

to the 3rd or 4th century. Nevertheless, the general tone of the patristic writings is clear; and such evidence as they supply is the more valuable, as being incidental and informal. The following quotations may suffice. *S. Clement* of Rome: "All [the Saints of old] were justified not by themselves or by their works, or by the righteousness which they wrought, but by His will. And so we, too, being called by His will in JESUS Christ, are not justified by ourselves, nor by our own wisdom or understanding or piety, nor by works which we wrought in holiness of heart; but through the faith by which Almighty God justified all [that have been justified] since the world began¹." *S. Polycarp*: "Ye are saved by Grace; not of works, but by the will of God through Jesus Christ²." *Origen*: "He [S. Paul] saith that the justification of faith only is sufficient, so that if any one do only believe, he is justified, though no [good] works have been fulfilled by him³." *S. Basil*: "This is perfect and complete joy in God, when one is not lifted up in the conceit of his own righteousness, but knows that he himself is wanting in true righteousness, and that he is justified only by faith in Christ⁴." *S. Bernard*: "Thou art as strong to justify as Thou art ready to pardon. Wherefore whosoever smitten with compunction for his sins hungers and thirsts after righteousness, let him believe on Thee Who justifiest the ungodly; and being justified by faith alone he will have peace with God⁵." It will be noticed that this string of patristic witnesses extends from the very verge of the Apostolic age to the twelfth century after Christ.

5. **Justification by Faith only.** "Justification by

¹ *Ad Corinth.* 32.

² *Ad Philip.*

³ *In Rom.* iii.

⁴ *De Humil.* Hom. XXII.

⁵ *In Cantic.* 22.

faith alone without works" is little more than another expression for "Justification by imputed righteousness only." Faith, being an entire dependance on the merit of Christ, necessarily excludes merit in the believer: so that to say that we are justified by faith is to say in other words that we are justified by the merit of Christ.

That faith, *in so far as it justifies*, is to be considered apart from works of every kind¹ seems clear from the following testimonies of Holy Scripture:

"The righteousness of God.....is by faith of JESUS Christ unto all and upon all them that believe.....being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ JESUS, Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness, that He might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in JESUS. Where is boasting then? It is excluded.....by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." "To him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." "David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works." "It is of faith, that it might be by grace." "Therefore being justified by faith we have [or, let us have] peace with God through our Lord JESUS Christ." (Romans iii. iv. and v., cf. ch. x. 4—6, 9—11.)

¹ The Schoolmen distinguished between a "*formed*" and an "*unformed*" faith, meaning by the latter what is more generally known as a 'dead faith,' by the former, faith "*made perfect by works.*" The former, they said, alone availed to justify. Luther and Calvin agreed to attack this distinction because it appeared to them to be aimed at the doctrine of justification by faith only. There is probably some truth on each side. We are justified by a faith which is at least potentially a *fides formata*: although the office of justifying belongs not to the works of faith but to faith itself.

"That no man is justified by the law in the sight of God it is evident: for 'the just shall live by faith.'" "If there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law: but the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." (Gal. iii. 11—22, cf. ch. ii. 16.)

"Not having mine own righteousness which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith." (Phil. iii. 9.)

6. **Roman Catholic reply: its insufficiency.** It is but fair to state the method by which these arguments, seemingly so invincible, are met on the Roman Catholic side. "True," they reply, "no man can be justified by the works of the Mosaic law, or by his own unaided efforts. The justice by which we are justified is not our own; it is God's work wrought in us by His grace: nor do we merit this grace of ourselves; it is vouchsafed to us for the merits of Christ."

The distinction is ingenious; but is it founded on any sound basis of Scriptural teaching? is it likely to be of any practical weight? Holy Scripture explicitly denies the merit of good works, even of those wrought in us by Divine grace¹ (S. Luke xvii. 10). Nor is it easy

¹ The Romanist divines suppose a radical difference between the works of the law, and the works of faith. But (1) both are the *fruits of Divine grace*; the saints who lived under the law surely did not obey God of their own unaided strength: (2) the two are *practically identical*; the Mosaic law is the rule of Christian as well as of earlier sanctity: (3) S. Paul's language equally excludes both from the office of justifying: for *it is to the principle of justification by works that he objects*, not to the works of one particular law in contrast with those of another. (Gal. iii. 11, 12.) The Law is insufficient to justify, simply because it recognises working, and not believing; whereas believing, not working, is that upon which the life of the just depends.

to see how boasting can be practically "excluded"¹ by a Church which anathematizes those who teach "that the good works of one that is justified are in such manner the gifts of God, as that they are not also the good merits of him that is justified."

7. **Doctrine of S. James.** A far more serious objection to the Anglican doctrine arises from the teaching of S. James (c. ii. 14--26). Certainly the language used by S. James appears to be the very negation of S. Paul's. But (1) it is by no means certain that S. James had in view either the doctrine of S. Paul, or any abuse of it by the Pauline Churches. A majority of modern critics fix the date of his epistle before the Council of Jerusalem, and therefore before the earliest of S. Paul's epistles had been written. It is thought, with much reason, that S. James intended to attack the barren orthodoxy of the Jews, rather than their tenet of justification by the law². (2) Whether this view be correct or not, a sober examination of the passage in S. James does not compel us to modify the doctrine which we have based upon the teaching of S. Paul. S. Paul nowhere asserts that the faith which justifies "hath not works;" on the contrary, he states distinctly that it is such a faith as "worketh by love" (Gal. v. 6). What he denies is the power of works *as works* to justify. S. James, on the other hand, denies this justifying power to an unworking faith; from his point of view, works justify and *not faith only*, because

¹ Rom. iii. 27.

² See Alford's *Gk. Test.* Vol. iv. Proleg. to S. James, p. 105, and Prof. Lightfoot's *Ep. to Galatians*, p. 157. "It becomes a question whether S. James' protest against reliance on faith alone has any reference, direct or indirect, to S. Paul's language and teaching: whether in fact it is not aimed against an entirely different type of religious feeling, against the Pharisaic spirit which rested satisfied with a barren orthodoxy fruitless in works of charity."

a faith which does not work is not a saving faith. It will be seen that the antagonism is verbal only: the two propositions are *not contradictory, but complementary* to one another; and both find their place in the doctrine of the English Church. (Art. XI. & XII. and *Homily of Salvation*.)

8. **Baptism in its Connection with Justification.**

The English Church, though she teaches that faith is the sole instrument of Justification, obviously represents Justification as an effect of Baptism (see quotations at the head of this Chapter). In fact, the authoritative "Homily of Salvation" uses the two terms "baptized" and "justified" as synonymous¹. How, it may be asked, can such expressions consist with the Eleventh Article? But the same difficulty presents itself in Holy Scripture. The Apostles preached "Believe on the Lord JESUS Christ and thou shalt be saved." Here faith alone is required. Our Lord taught, "He that believeth *and is baptized* shall be saved." Here faith and baptism are both made necessary.

The solution seems to lie in S. Augustine's name for Baptism, "*the Sacrament of Faith*."² Holy Bap-

¹ *Hom.* Bk. I. III. 3.

² *Ep.* xcviII. Compare the following passage which occurs in a treatise "*De fide*," relegated by the Benedictine editors to the Appendix and assigned to Fulgentius, Bp. of Ruspe, an eminent disciple of S. Augustine, who flourished in the 5th century. "Doubt not in any wise that excepting those who for the Name of Christ are baptized in their own blood, no man will receive eternal life who has not been converted from his sins by penitence and faith and set free by the Sacrament of penitence and faith. For those of riper years it is necessary to repent of their own sins, to hold the Catholic faith according to the rule of truth, and to receive the Sacrament of Baptism: for little children, however, who cannot personally believe or repent of their original sin, the Sacrament of faith and penitence, that is Holy Baptism, suffices for salvation, so long as their tender age is incapable of more." (S. August. *Opp.* VI. 1131, C, D.)

tism is the divinely appointed means of formally applying to the soul the merit of our Lord, which faith apprehends and appropriates.

To the adult, therefore, both are necessary—faith in all cases; Baptism where it may be had, or in its absence, at least the desire of Baptism. In the infant, faith being impossible, the sacrament of faith is accepted in lieu of faith itself; it being understood that should he grow to riper years, personal faith is still required.

Thus while Baptism is the formal act on God's part of conferring justification; faith is the hand into which the gift is placed, and by which it is continually appropriated. A state of faith is a state of Justification: but a state of faith ordinarily and formally begins with Baptism. (Galatians iii. 26, 27.)

§ ii. *Of Good Works.*

I. Fundamental Difference. From the Anglican point of view Good Works (i. e. works *pleasing to God*) are the necessary result of that living union with Christ which belongs to those who believe and are baptized. The life of the True Vine circulating through its branches bears in them all the fruits of righteousness. And to these fruits God has promised a reward. Imperfect in themselves, such works are nevertheless acceptable to Him in Christ; deserving no return from God, they will nevertheless be recompensed, of His own free grace, with eternal life.

The Tridentine doctrine of Justification by infused righteousness leads to an opposite conclusion. It is indeed of God's free mercy that justifying grace is infused in the first instance: but being infused, the works which it produces merit (1) the increase of

grace itself, and (2) eternal life in those who persevere. Christ merits for us the grace that justifies: and by that grace we merit the reward of glory¹.

2. **Use of the word 'merit' by the Fathers.** It is freely granted that the word *merit* is applied by the Latin Fathers to the good works of the justified, not however in the Tridentine sense of a true and proper desert. "We may observe (writes Archbishop Usher) that *merits* in their writings do ordinarily signify nothing but *works*...and to *merit* simply to procure or to attain, without any relation at all to the dignity [i. e. worthiness] either of the person or the work²." On the other hand there is no lack of patristic testimonies against the Roman position. "What can we do," asks *S. Ambrose*, "worthy of the heavenly rewards³?" "Everlasting rest" (writes *S. Basil*) "is laid up for them that strive lawfully in this life, not to be rendered according to the debt of works, but vouchsafed according to the grace of a bountiful God to those who hope in Him⁴." "If we consider our own merits we must despair," adds *S. Jerome*⁵. *S. Augustine* witnesses, "We hold God our debtor; How? Because of His promises. We say not to God, 'pay what Thou hast received' but 'pay what Thou hast promised⁶.'" *S. Anselm* of Canterbury: "If a man should serve God a thousand years, and that most fervently; he

¹ See Bellarmine, *de Justif.* I. "The common belief of all [Roman] Catholics is that the good works of the righteous are truly and properly merits, and that they merit the reward of eternal life." Again, c. XXI: "The Council of Trent teaches that a justified man may merit of condignity the increase of righteousness."

² *Ans. to a Jesuit*, p. 499.

³ *In Ps.* cxviii.

⁴ *In Ps.* cxiv.

⁵ *In Esai.* c. 64.

⁶ *In Ps.* lxxxiii.

would not deserve, of condignity, to be half a day in the kingdom of Heaven¹." Finally, *S. Bernard* "above others delivereth this doctrine most sweetly:" "It is necessary that first of all thou shouldest believe that thou canst not have remission of sins but by the mercy of God: then, that thou canst not have any good work at all, except He give thee also this: and lastly, that by no good works canst thou merit life eternal, except it likewise be freely given to thee²."

3. **Scripture cited by the Romanists.** To turn now to Holy Scripture. *Bellarmino* finds the doctrine of human merit in two classes of passages: those which speak of men as "counted worthy" of the Kingdom of God³, and those which represent eternal life as the reward or hire of God's servants⁴. We answer (1) that the worthiness of the faithful consists in their *meetness* for glory⁵—(2) that God does indeed recompense His servants, but not of debt, although, speaking after the manner of men, this recompense is called their hire. "Neither do we take away the *reward* because we deny the *merit* of good works... The question is *whence* he that soweth [righteousness] must expect to reap so great and so sure a reward: whether from God's justice, or from His mercy? We think here that the Prophet David hath fully cleared the case in that one sentence, (Ps. lxii. 12) '*with Thee, O Lord, is mercy: for Thou rewardest every man according to his work*⁶.'"

4. **Works of Supererogation.** The xivth Article at once states and refutes the Roman tenet on this

¹ *De mensuratione crucis.*

² *Serm. I. in Annunt. B. Mariæ.*

³ *e.g.* 2 Thess. i. 5; Rev. iii. 4.

⁴ *e.g.* Rev. xxii. 12; S. Matt. xx. 8.

⁵ For this sense of *ἀξιος* and its derivatives compare S. Matt. iii. 8, Acts xxvi. 20, 1 Cor. xi. 27, 29, 3 S. John 6.

⁶ Usher, *Answ.* pp. 493—4.

subject¹. It remains but to expand this authoritative definition and refutation. (1) "*Supererogatio*" is literally *paying in excess of debts*. Every Christian is in duty bound to keep the commandments of God. But beside direct commandments, the Gospel contains "*counsels of perfection*," e. g. invitations to celibacy and poverty. To fulfil these is to merit a reward in excess of that which belongs to those who fulfil the bare letter of God's law; for it is to render to God an obedience over and above that which He requires. It is added that the superfluity of merit thus obtained passes into the common treasury of the Church, whence it may be dispensed at the will of the Roman See to those who need such spiritual aid to supply their own deficiencies². (2) How far the Church of Rome as a Church is responsible for all the details of this speculation, may be fairly questioned. Yet there can be little doubt that the popular belief on the subject is a natural outgrowth from her doctrine of merit. Works of supererogation, if they do not necessarily stand with that doctrine, must at least fall with it. Of course it is not denied that Scripture sometimes commands, sometimes only counsels (see e. g. 1 Cor. vii. 25, 27, 40); or that some states of life (e. g. Holy Orders) are not intended to be common to all the faithful. Nor would we deny that such special acts or states of self consecration, undertaken for the love of God and of His Church, may be attended by special measures of spiritual comfort and grace, by special rewards, also, in the world to come. But we do not venture to assert that persons who are called to

¹ The Council of Trent has not expressly mentioned "works of supererogation:" but by retaining indulgences, it seems to have assumed their existence. Bellarmine treats of the subject at length in his second book *de Monachis*.

² On the subject of *Indulgences* see Ch. v.

these more eminent services render to God an obedience in excess of that which is due to His perfect law. Can any human obedience exceed or indeed attain to the height of the command, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart ... and thy neighbour as thyself"? Can any of the Saints use other language than that which Christ has put into their mouths, "We are unprofitable servants"? Nay, can any one of them even dare to add "We have done that which was our duty to do"? And if not, where are works of supererogation, 'over and above God's commandments?'

CHAPTER IV.

OF SUPREMACY AND INFALLIBILITY.

CHURCH OF ROME.

"The Roman Church...is the mother and mistress of all churches."—Council of Trent. Sess. VII. Can. iii.

"The Prince of the Apostles, Peter."—Sess. VI. Chap. xi.

"His own (God's) Vicar on earth...[the Roman Pontiff]."

"The Roman Pontiff...by the authority of His own supreme see."—Sess. VI. § ii. Chap. i.

"Her ruler and Governor [the Church's] is also one: the invisible one, indeed, Christ...but the visible, he who as the legitimate successor of Peter the Prince of the Apostles occupies the See of Rome."

"This One Church, because governed by the Holy Ghost, cannot err in delivering the discipline of faith and morals."—Cat. Council of Trent, I. x. 10, 17.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

"I believe One Catholick and Apostolick Church."—Nicene Creed.

"The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same."

As the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred; so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of Ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith."—Article XIX.

"General Councils may err and sometimes have erred even in things pertaining unto God."—Article XXI.

"The Queen's Majesty hath the chief power in this Realm of England, and other her Dominions, unto whom the

chief Government of all Estates of this Realm, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign Jurisdiction.

“Where we attribute to the Queen’s Majesty the chief government, by which Titles we understand the minds of some slanderous folks to be offended; we give not to our Princes the ministering either of God’s Word, or of the Sacraments, the which thing the Injunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our Queen do most plainly testify; but that only prerogative, which we see to have been given always to all godly Princes in holy Scriptures by God himself; that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers.

“The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this Realm of England.—Article XXXVII.

A Church (ἐκκλησία) is in its simplest form a “congregation” of two or more persons professing faith in JESUS CHRIST, and baptized into His name. (S. Matt. xviii. 17—20, xxviii. 19). Thus, in the New Testament we read of the Church in a private dwelling-house (I Cor. xvi. 19), *i. e.* the Christian members of a family; thus, again, Tertullian lays down the maxim that

“where there are three, even laics, there is a Church¹.” “*The Visible Church*” is the aggregate of all such congregations of faithful men² at any time living upon earth. It is ONE, because it proceeds from one origin (*S. Cyprian*): holds one faith (*S. Jerome*): partakes of the same sacraments (Eph. iv. 5, 1 Cor. x. 17): and has one head, even Christ (*S. Augustine*). It is HOLY, because its members are consecrated to God in Holy Baptism (1 Cor. vi. 11), called to be saints (Rom. i. 7), builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit (Eph. ii. 22). It is CATHOLIC³, or Universal, as comprehending within itself all particular Churches: as diffused through all ages and all countries of the world (*S. Cyril of Jerusalem*), and as distinguished from all

¹ *Exhort. ad Castit.* 5. Cf. *de fugâ*, 13: “sit tibi et in tribus Ecclesia.”

² *Faithful men* = men professing faith, the baptized who continue in Christian communion. The term cannot here bear the stricter ethical sense which belongs to it in the Catechism [“the Body and Blood of Christ are received by *the faithful* in the Lord’s Supper”]: for the XIXth Article treats only of the *Visible Church*, in which the evil be ever mingled with the good. For the New Testament use of *οἱ πιστοὶ* in this looser application, cf. Eph. i. 1; 1 Tim. iv. 12, vi. 2; Tit. i. 6.

³ On the derivation and use of the term *Catholic*, see Bp. Pearson *On the Creed*, Art. XIX. As applied to the Church it seems to have meant (1) *general* as opposed to *particular* and hence (2) *orthodox* as opposed to *heretical*. In the second sense it was applied even to particular churches—thus “the Catholic Church of Constantinople,” would mean the orthodox communion of that city—to particular Bishops, every orthodox Bishop being called a Bishop of the Catholic Church,—lastly to individual Christians, belonging to any branch of the Orthodox Church. Thus according to the primitive use of the word a *Catholic* is simply a member of any orthodox Christian communion which possesses the notes of the Visible Church. It will be seen that for Anglicans to concede this title to members of the Roman Church as an exclusive right is to stamp themselves with the brand of heresy or schism or both. Hence the extreme pertinacity with which Romanists lay claim to the name of Catholics.

heretical and schismatical communions (*S. Augustine*). It is APOSTOLIC, as being connected with the Apostles by continuity of doctrine, practice and succession (Acts ii. 42, Eph. ii. 20, Rev. xxi. 14). To this Church and to every true Branch of it belong three notes or marks, *viz.*: (1) purity of doctrine, as to essentials of faith; (2) a due administration of the sacraments; (3) the right use of discipline¹.

So far there can be little ground for difference, excepting that Roman Catholic divines have perhaps unnecessarily multiplied the notes of the Church (cf. Bellarmine, *de Eccl. Milit.* iv. 2, 3). But we join serious issue when the Roman Church proceeds to assert (*a*) the existence of a divinely appointed visible Head over the Catholic Church, and (*b*) the infallibility of the Church which is under his headship.

§ i. *Of Supremacy.*

1. **Supposed Supremacy of S. Peter.** “[Roman] Catholics affirm,” says Bellarmine, “that the Apostle Peter was appointed by Christ to be Head and Prince of the whole Church in the room of Christ Himself².”

Now that S. Peter, whether by seniority of years (*S. Jerome*), or of call to the Apostleship (*S. Cyprian*), or by “a primacy of confession” (*S. Ambrose*), was *primus* of the Apostolic College, may well be allowed. S. Matthew distinctly calls him “the first” (c. x. 2): his name heads each of the four lists of Apostles (S. Matt. x., S. Mark iii., S. Luke vi., Acts i.), and the

¹ The third of these *Notes* is not expressly mentioned in the XIXth Article, but it seems to be included by implication in the second. The Homily for Whitsun Day is more explicit: “The true Church...hath always these notes or marks whereby it is known: pure and sound doctrine, the Sacraments ministered according to CHRIST’S holy institution, and the right use of ecclesiastical discipline.”

² *De Rom. Pont.* I. x.

position which S. Peter takes on all occasions of importance before the call of S. Paul (cf. Acts i. 15, ii. 14, iii. 6, 12, iv. 8, &c.) is in harmony with such a conclusion. The question is, Was he *primus inter pares*? or had he been invested with an authority of divine right over his fellow Apostles?

Those who assume the correctness of the latter view are met at the outset by formidable difficulties. Did not our Lord strive to impress upon His Apostles that they had but one master, even Himself, and that they all were brethren? (S. Matt. xxiii. 8.) Did He not promise to them all a like degree of dignity as assessors to His throne? (S. Matt. xix. 28.) Did not S. John in the Apocalypse see engraved on the foundation-stones of the Church, the names of all "the twelve Apostles of the Lamb"? And, to turn to matters of fact, was it not S. James rather than S. Peter who took the lead at the "Council" of Jerusalem? Did not S. Paul share with S. Peter, after the manner of an equal, the evangelisation of the world? Did he not assert himself to be "not a whit behind the very chiefest Apostles"? Did he not speak of having "the care of all the Churches"? Did he not sharply rebuke the faithful at Corinth who claimed to be in some exclusive sense "of Cephas"? Nay, did he not withstand S. Peter himself to the face "because he was to be blamed"? (Galat. ii. 11.) It is clearly for those who style S. Peter Head and Prince of the whole Church to explain how these facts can be brought into harmony with their theory.

Let us next weigh the Scripture "proofs" which are offered on the Roman side. They are to be found in S. John xxi. 15—17, and S. Matt. xvi. 18, 19¹. (1) From the passage in S. John it is argued that our Lord gave

¹ S. Luke xxii. 31 is also pleaded : with what success the reader can judge by inspection.

to S. Peter a special commission to feed—*i. e.* to teach and rule¹—His flock. But, as many of the Fathers have pointed out, there were obvious reasons for singling out S. Peter on this occasion. He alone had denied Christ: he alone needed to be reinstated into his Apostleship. So *S. Cyril* of Alexandria: "By the words of our Lord, 'Feed my sheep,' a renewal as it were of the Apostolate already conferred on him is understood to take place²." Others see in the thrice repeated commission a reference to the thrice repeated fall. And some there are of the early writers who, almost as if they anticipated a misapplication of the passage, have been careful to point out that the privilege thus accorded to S. Peter was by no means peculiar to him. "Christ Himself" (says *S. Basil*) "gave to all succeeding pastors and teachers a like authority³." Thus, too, *S. Augustine*: "In that it was said to S. Peter, it was said to all, 'Feed my sheep'." And our own *Bede*, "The other Apostles were the same that Peter was, but the first place is given to S. Peter, that the unity of the Church may be commended. All are shepherds, but the flock is shewn [in this way] to be but one."

(2) But the words of Christ recorded in S. Matt. xvi. are the keystone of the Roman dogma. They contain

(a) A declaration as to the future building of the Catholic Church: and (b) a promise to S. Peter himself. (a) "*Upon this Rock I will build my Church.*" Are we to understand by "this Rock" S. Peter personally or officially? S. Peter as one amongst others or as "Coryphæus" of the Apostles? or again, S. Peter's faith and confession? or finally, our Blessed Lord Himself Whom

¹ βόσκειν—ποιμαίνειν. See Trench, *Syn. New Testament*, I. p. 95.

² *Comm. in S. Joannem*, xxi.

³ *Constit. Monach.* c. XXII.

S. Peter had confessed? It is remarkable that the Fathers give no unanimous verdict on the question; indeed the same Father sometimes departs from his own earlier interpretation, or combines two or more of these distinct views. *Origen* would include "every disciple" in the "Rock": "If you think that the whole Church is built by God on one alone [*sc.* S. Peter] what will you say of John the son of thunder or of the other Apostles¹?" *S. Cyprian* thinks that S. Peter is addressed as the leading representative of the rest; "Upon one He builds His Church, and though He gives an equal power to all the Apostles...yet that He might manifest its unity He settled by His authority an origin of that unity springing from one. The other Apostles were indeed the same that S. Peter was, partners, with equal shares, both in honour and power: but the beginning proceeds from unity that the Church may be seen to be one²." *S. Hilary* of Poitiers, *S. Epiphanius*, *S. Ambrose*, *S. Chrysostom*, *S. Cyril* of Alexandria, *Theodoret* and *S. Gregory* the Great understand by the Rock either the confession of S. Peter, or S. Peter as a faithful confessor: "upon this rock of confession is the building up of the Church: this faith is the foundation of the Church:" "He built the Church on his confession:" "the rock of the Church, that is, the confession of S. Peter the chief of the Apostles." Elsewhere, however, some of these Fathers offer an alternative view: thus *S. Cyril* once represents S. Peter himself as the rock: whilst *SS. Ambrose* and *Gregory* teach that "the Rock is Christ." *S. Jerome* combines both views: "Christ is the Rock Who granted to His Apostles that they should be called rocks³." But the most striking proof of the difficulty which the

¹ *In Matth.* xii. 10.

² *De Unit. Eccl.* p. 107.

³ *In Am.* vi. 12.

Fathers felt in fixing the interpretation of this passage is presented by the following sentences from the "Retractations" of S. Augustine. "I said in a certain place of the Apostle Peter that on him as on a Rock the Church is founded.—But I am aware that afterwards I very frequently expounded the words [S. Matt. xvi.] as said of our Lord...*Peter* being so named from this Rock [*Petra*], and thus representing the Church which is built upon the Rock. For it was not said to him 'Thou art the Rock' [*Petra*], but, 'Thou art *Peter*.' The Rock was Christ, Whom Simon confessing, as the whole Church confesses Him, was called *Peter*. Of these two views, then, let the reader determine which is the more probable¹."

The question thus left open by the Primitive Catholic Church has been closed by the modern Church of Rome, and on this arbitrary decision the foundation of her entire system is laid. Nothing is plainer than that if S. Augustine's alternative view be right, if nearly half the writers of antiquity be not palpably in error, the dogma of Papal Supremacy is but "the baseless fabric of a vision."

We pass now to the grant made by our Lord to S. Peter (*b*) "*I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven.*" What may be the precise meaning of "the power of the keys," is at present immaterial. The one question is, Are we to understand that this power was granted to S. Peter exclusively, or even in a peculiar and superlative degree? Here the Fathers are more nearly unanimous; but their unanimity is adverse to Rome. *Origen* asks incredulously, "What! are the keys given by the Lord to Peter only?²" *S. Cyprian* derives from this grant to S. Peter the power possessed by all the Bishops of the Catholic Church.

¹ *Retr.* I. 21.

² *Comm. in Matt.*

S. Ambrose distinctly teaches, "What is said to Peter is said to the Apostles [as a body]." *S. Augustine* writes "These keys were received not by one man, but by the unity of the Church...Did Peter receive the keys and not Paul? Peter, and not John and James and the rest of the Apostles?" *S. Leo*, himself a Bishop of Rome, "This trust was given to S. Peter because Peter stands as an example for all the pastors of the Church." *Tertullian* finds in this special and earlier grant of the keys to S. Peter nothing more than a promise that he should be the first after the day of Pentecost to preach and baptize. "The Church was built on him, [Peter] *i.e.* by his instrumentality; he first used the keys when he said, 'Ye men of Israel, hear these words'—he first by Christ's Baptism opened the door of the kingdom of heaven²."

The above citations clearly shew how far were the Fathers of the early Church from grounding a theory of Petrine supremacy upon the texts which the Romanists advance. It may be added that the general language of the Fathers is inconsistent with any belief in such a supremacy. They do not hesitate indeed to speak in the strongest terms of S. Peter's personal pre-eminence. He is the "foreman," the "prolocutor," the "head," the "Coryphæus³" of the Apostolic body. Yet as to official honour and dignity he is considered as on a par with S. John and S. Paul: he is classed sometimes with SS. James and John, sometimes with his brother S. Andrew: other Apostles receive titles as lofty and imposing. Of S. Paul in particular, language is held which might be easily turned into an assertion of his supremacy over S. Peter himself. Thus S. Chrysostom styles the Apostle of the Gentiles,

¹ *Serm.* ccxix.

² See Bp. Kaye, *Tertullian*, pp. 236, 7.

³ See BARROW, *On Supremacy* (*Works*, VII. 195).

"Apostle of the world," "the planter of the Church," "the foundation of the faith," "the pillar and ground of the truth."

2. **Derivation of S. Peter's Supremacy to the See of Rome.** Supposing the supremacy of S. Peter proved, it would yet remain for the Romanists to establish three further positions, viz. (1) that this supremacy was transferable to the Apostle's official successors, (2) that S. Peter was himself Diocesan Bishop of Rome, (3) that the supremacy of the See of Rome thus derived by succession from S. Peter was acknowledged by the Catholic Church of the first ages.

Now, (1) assumes that S. Peter's supposed prerogative was official and not simply personal. But whatever priority Scripture assigns to S. Peter is obviously personal. Officially, as we have seen, S. Paul claimed equality with S. Peter; the first of the Apostolic College is on a par with the rest. It is hard to see how such a personal pre-eminence could have been inherited by official succession.

With regard to (2), the evidence is as follows. S. Peter dates his former Epistle from *Babylon*, *i.e.* according to an opinion stated by Eusebius¹ and supported by S. Jerome, from *Rome*. Modern critics incline to the more natural view, that S. Peter wrote from Babylon on the Euphrates; and this conclusion derives some support from the order in which the countries mentioned in ch. i. 1 are enumerated, *i.e.* from East to West, as they would present themselves to the mind of a person writing from a place East of Asia Minor. Assuming, however, the correctness of S. Jerome's opinion, the only inference that can safely be drawn from it is that S. Peter was at Rome at the particular time when he composed his first Epistle. That he was there as Bishop is not even hinted, either

¹ *H. E.* II. 15.

in his own Epistles or in the Epistles written by S. Paul to or from Rome. It is scarcely less remarkable that S. Clement of Rome, though he mentions both S. Peter and S. Paul, is silent as to the Roman episcopate of the former. Both Apostles are held forth in equally eulogistic terms as ensamples to the flock.

We come now to a group of early writers who vouch for the fact that S. Peter, either alone or in common with S. Paul, was *founder* of the Roman Church. *S. Irenæus* is the first (c. A.D. 175): "We can reckon up (he says) both those who by the Apostles were appointed Bishops in the Churches and the successors of those Bishops...But since it would occupy too much space to enumerate the successions of all the Churches, we will merely indicate the Apostolical tradition...of the greatest and most ancient and universally known Church founded at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul....These blessed Apostles, then, after founding and organizing that Church, delivered to Linus the episcopal office of administering it. To him succeeded Anacletus; and after him in the third place from the Apostles, Clement.....¹" *Tertullian*, on the other hand, speaks of Clement as "ordained by Peter²;" whilst the *Apostolical Constitutions* state that Linus was consecrated by S. Paul, and Clement by S. Peter, after the death of Linus.

These varying accounts doubtless admit of reconciliation. At any rate they seem to establish upon a fairly sound historical basis the fact that S. Peter shared with S. Paul the work of founding the Church and See of Rome. Manifestly however they do not imply that S. Peter was himself Bishop of Rome. In fact they are hopelessly at variance with such a theory; for they represent the See as held by two or even three other

¹ *Adv. Hæres.* VII. 3.

² *Adv. Hæret.* II.

persons during the lifetime of the Apostle. Nor do they assign to S. Peter any more direct connection with Rome than to S. Paul, or than S. Peter himself held with any other Church which he had helped to found. The Romanists have still to shew either that S. Peter consecrated no other Bishop but the Bishop of Rome¹; or that the right of inheriting S. Peter's supremacy was secured exclusively to the Roman See.

(3) Again, was the supremacy of the Roman Bishops, as the legitimate successors to S. Peter's prerogative, acknowledged by the Early Church?

It is admitted that the authority of the Roman See was from the first very considerable. Various causes combined to render it so : principally two—the *political importance of Rome* and the *prestige of Apostolical origin which belonged to the Roman Church*. In order to exhibit the working of these influences it will be needful to enter a little into the constitution of the primitive Episcopate.

As early as the 2nd century there are traces of an ecclesiastical arrangement by which the Bishop of a *Metropolis* or principal city of the Empire acquired a superiority over the other bishoprics (*paræciæ*) within his own province (*eparchia*). Such a prerogative for instance was held by S. Irenæus among the Bishops of Gaul². This kind of primacy was established on a firmer footing by the 6th Canon of the 1st Council of

¹ The Church of Antioch boasted of having received its Episcopate from S. Peter : nay he is even said by S. Jerome to have been bishop of that see. And the modern Church of Rome has allowed the claim by establishing a festival in honour of the Chair of S. Peter at Antioch (*Missal*. Fest. Febr. xxii). On what intelligible principle can it be held that whilst Antioch and Rome shared the honour of S. Peter's episcopal supervision, Rome alone retains the permanent heritage of his supremacy?

² Euseb. *H. E.* v. 23.

Nicæa (325), which ordained that "the ancient precedents be maintained which prevail in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, so that the Bishop of Alexandria have power over all these Bishops, since this is also customary in the case of the Bishop of Rome: that in like manner in Antioch and in the other provinces the several churches preserve their respective privileges, dignities, and authority." The canon proceeds to designate the primates so established by the title of *metropolitans*.

With Constantine's readjustment of the Empire there sprang up among the metropolitans a fresh distribution of ecclesiastical power. The Bishop of the chief city in each of the newly-formed Imperial *diœceses* exercised authority over the other metropolitans and bishops of that particular *diœcesis*. Such superior metropolitans were known as *exarchs*, *archbishops*, or *patriarchs*. Four of these patriarchs again, owing to the exceptional importance of the cities where their sees were placed, rose to a position pre-eminent above the rest. Three of the four are expressly named in the Nicene Canon already cited, as leading Metropolitans: viz. the Bishops of Alexandria, of Rome and of Antioch. The fourth was supplied by Constantine's new capital; the 2nd General Council (*Constantinople*, 381) ordaining that "the Bishop of Constantinople take precedence next after the Bishop of Rome, because Constantinople is a new (or second) Rome." Thus the constitution of the Church was brought as nearly as possible into correspondence with that of the empire: four great ecclesiastical Patriarchates answered to the four Prætorian præfectures which divided the civil administration of the Roman world¹.

¹ The complete organisation of the Catholic Church after the Empire became Christian may be concisely presented in the following form :

Next followed, almost as a matter of course, a struggle for precedence between the greater Patriarchs. In this struggle the Bishops of Alexandria and Antioch could scarcely hope to hold their own. No Church had so well-founded a claim on the ground of antiquity as that of Antioch, where "the disciples were first called Christians¹." No Patriarch had such extensive power in his own patriarchate as the Patriarch of Alexandria; and no other city had contributed so largely to the intellectual treasures of Christendom. But, not to mention the schisms by which each of these Churches was rent, their superior claims were overshadowed by the vastly greater political importance of the two Imperial cities. Between Rome and Constantinople the prize, therefore, lay. The battle opened at the 4th general Council (*Chalcedon*, 451), when a canon was passed which secured to the Bishop of Constantinople equal privileges with those of his brother at Rome. The words are these: "Following the decrees of the Holy Fathers...we decree and ordain the same things concerning the privileges of the most holy Church of Constantinople, or New Rome. For to the See of Old Rome, because it was the Imperial City, the Fathers with good reason accorded peculiar honours. And moved by the same considerations, the 150 Bishops [at Constantinople] awarded equal honours

1. The whole Empire Eastern and Western was divided into 14 *dioceses*, superintended by as many *Exarchs* or *Patriarchs*: of whom three, afterwards four, took an honourable precedence, viz. the Bishops of Rome, Antioch, Alexandria [and Constantinople].

2. Each Diocese contained a certain number of Provinces or *Eparchies* governed by *Metropolitans*.

3. Each Province was subdivided into *Parishes*, *Paræcie* [our modern *Dioceses*], superintended by their own Bishops.

Cf. Wordsworth, *On the Church*, pp. 43, 44.

¹ Robertson, *Church Hist.* i. 302. Bingham, i. 66.

to the most holy See of New Rome; rightly judging that a city which has been honoured as the seat of the Imperial government and of the Senate, and which enjoys like honours with the older Imperial Rome, should in ecclesiastical matters also be raised to a like dignity with her." This canon was passed in the absence of the Roman legates, and the Roman Bishop of course refused to be bound by it: nevertheless it sufficiently expresses the independence of the East, and the real basis on which the early supremacy of Rome rested.

However, notwithstanding the Council of Chalcedon, the power of the great Eastern Patriarch gradually waned before that of the Western. The removal of the seat of the Western Empire to Ravenna (404) left the Bishop of Rome virtually master of the old capital: whilst his rival at Constantinople was hampered by the constant interference of the Emperor. Again, the controversies of the East, and the jealousy entertained towards Constantinople by Antioch and Alexandria, frequently gave to the remaining great Patriarch the position of an arbiter between contending factions: and the frequent exercise of arbitration led insensibly to a claim of hearing appeals as of divine right. But the chief cause of Rome's superiority in the struggle with Constantinople lay in the fact of her Apostolical origin. She was not only the Church of an Imperial City: she was also what Constantinople was not and could not become, the Church of SS. Peter and Paul. From the earliest times profound respect had been shewn by Catholics to all sees which owed their foundation to the personal ministry of an Apostle. They were reasonably supposed to possess the traditionary faith in a purer form than other Churches. One passage from Tertullian will suffice to illustrate this point. "Come now (he writes) thou who wouldst exercise thy curiosity in the business of thy salvation, run through

the *Apostolical Churches*, where the very chairs of the Apostles are still occupied, where their authentic letters are read. Art thou in the neighbourhood of Achaia? there is Corinth. If near Macedonia, there is Philippi or Thessalonica. If thou canst make a journey to Asia, there is Ephesus. If again thou art close to Italy, there is Rome, whence we, [African Churches,] as being near at hand, derive our authority. Happy Church, upon which Apostles lavished their whole teaching together with their own blood¹."

Now the Roman was the only Church which united Imperial prestige with this kind of Apostolicity. Constantinople was Imperial but not Apostolical; Antioch Apostolical but not Imperial. Was it not in the very nature of things that Rome should exert a pre-eminent influence amongst the Churches of Christendom? Had she not good reason to shew for her pre-eminence? And if she had been content with this kind of superiority would either the Anglican or the Eastern Church have ever upon this score renounced her Communion²?

The ambition of the Roman Bishops, however, was by no means satisfied with a mere precedence in the Christian world; nor were their claims of supremacy confined to the limits of their own Patriarchate. It is possible to mark the steps by which they rose to their present position, and to hear the protests by which their first acts of usurpation were met. The

¹ *De Præscr. adv. hæret.* 14.

² The Anglican Church has never formally denied the Patriarchal jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome within the limit of his own ancient patriarchate. Nor is it probable that she would have thought it needful to refuse to him the precedence among bishops which the early Church was wont to concede, if the concession had not been converted by the Roman See into a *right*, and the precedence into a *supremacy*.

earlier Councils were neither assembled nor presided over by the Bishops of Rome. At Nicæa, Constantine was moderator. At Sardica, the venerable Hosius took precedence of Julius of Rome. At Constantinople the Eastern Church assumed the lead. At Ephesus, "Cyril, Pope of Alexandria," presided in the absence of the Roman Pontiff: the See of Rome had begun to assert a right of precedence. But this precedence had not yet grown into an invariable supremacy; for the fifth general Council was presided over by the Patriarch of Constantinople, and the sixth by the Emperor Constantinus Pogonatus¹. On the contrary, the history of centuries III.—VI. abounds with instances of Roman claims disowned or sternly rebuked by the Fathers of the Catholic Church. In the *third* century we find Stephen of Rome excommunicating S. Cyprian of Carthage: upon which S. Cyprian at once opened communication with another prelate, Firmilian of Cæsarea, with whom Stephen had dealt in a similar way. Neither of these two great Bishops appears to have viewed the Papal pretensions with much respect. "None of us" (say the Bishops of Africa, with S. Cyprian at their head) "styles himself Bishop of Bishops, or forces his colleagues to obedience by the dread of his tyranny: since every bishop is free to act as he will, according to the liberty and power which belong to him; nor can he be judged by another, in such sort as he cannot become the other's judge. But we await, one and all, the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, Who alone has the power both of preferring us in the government of His Church and of judging of our conduct²." Firmilian uses yet stronger language: "How mighty a sin thou [Stephen] hast heaped to thyself in

¹ Barrow, VII. 341, &c.

² *Conc. Carth. ap. Cypr.*

cutting thyself off from so many flocks! For do not deceive thyself: it is thou who hast cut off thine own self: he is the real schismatic who makes himself an apostate from the communion of the Church's unity¹." Passing to the *fourth* century, we find an important privilege accorded to the Roman Bishop by the Western Council of Sardica (347). By this Council it was ordained that any bishop who had been condemned by a synod might appeal under certain restrictions to Julius, Bishop of Rome, the concession being grounded on the "honour due to the memory of the Apostle Peter." It is evident, however, that the appeal is granted not of right, but by courtesy; nor does the decree refer to the See of Rome, as such, but simply to a particular bishop. Yet the precedent thus established was eagerly utilized by the successors of Julius. Thus, at the beginning of the *fifth* century, Pope Zosimus, appealing to a canon of the Nicene Council which gave him jurisdiction in the matter, ventured to restore to the priesthood an African presbyter, one Apiarius, who had been degraded by his own diocesan. The African bishops requested that an inquiry might be made into the genuineness of the Nicene canon: whereupon it proved to be none other than the decree of the Council of Sardica fathered upon the first General Council. Celestine, one of the successors of Zosimus, attempted again to interfere in support of this same Apiarius; and again the African bishops successfully, however courteously, disproved his right of intervention. "Your reverence (they write to the Roman bishop) will readily perceive that this point has been settled by the Nicene Council.....Most wisely and justly has it provided that all matters shall be terminated in the places where they have arisen.....Whoever requests

¹ Firmil. *Ep.* LXXV. (*in Op. Cypr.*)

it, do not send your clergy to execute your orders,... lest we appear to be bringing the arrogance, ambition, and pride of the world into the Church of Christ¹."

These salient instances may serve to shew at once how early the usurpations of the Roman See commenced, and how bravely they were resisted even in the Western Church, until political power, persistent assertion, growing ignorance of history, and lastly, the forged decretals of the eighth and ninth centuries, succeeded in stamping out the ancient liberties of Christendom. How long it was before even the Popes themselves conceived the full idea of their present pretensions will best appear from the following words of Pope Gregory I., written at the end of the sixth century: "My fellow priest, John [of Constantinople] would fain be called *Universal Bishop*. I am compelled to exclaim, 'O tempora, O mores!' Even priests seek for themselves ambitious names, and glory in new and profane titles....Far from the hearts of Christians be that name of blasphemy² wherein the honour of all priests is sacrificed whilst it is madly arrogated by a single individual³."

¹ The African Church at last found it necessary to enact [Co. of Milevis, 416] that any priest or deacon who presumed to appeal beyond seas [i. e. to Rome] should be excluded from the communion of all the Churches of Africa (Bingham, I. 348).

² The identical title thus rejected with horror by Gregory I. was claimed by his successor Gregory VII. (see Faber, *Diff. of Rom.* p. 191). Anciently it belonged to the Bishop of Constantinople; and Gregory's righteous indignation seems to have been stirred rather by the prestige which it gave to the Constantinopolitan See than by the sinfulness of the title itself. It is curious that most of the titles now monopolized by the Roman Pontiffs were originally held by them in common with other Bishops. All Bishops were anciently styled 'Vicars of Christ,' 'Successors of the apostles' and 'Popes.'

³ Greg. Magn. *Ep.* IV. 32.

3. **Patriarchal Authority of the Pope over the English Church.** "The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England;" *i. e.* (according to the more explicit terms of the Oath of Supremacy) no "power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, *Ecclesiastical or Spiritual.*" Such is the independent language of the English Church. We have seen how amply she is justified in resisting the Pope's claim of universal supremacy. But there still remains in her case another claim, that of patriarchal authority. Is not the English Church placed by the sixth canon of the first General Council under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome, as *Patriarch of the West*?

We answer in the negative, for two reasons. (a) The early Patriarchal system rested (see p. 56) on a purely political basis. Hence, when the political power of Antioch, Alexandria and Rome declined, the prerogatives of the three great Sees, *as matter of right*, were at an end. Any precedence which they still retained was retained only by the courtesy of other Churches; and no Church, it may fairly be argued, was bound to yield obedience, after the grounds on which the jurisdiction was founded had ceased to exist. The Roman Patriarchate, in short, was an institution not of Divine right, but of human expediency: temporary in its very nature, because based upon the circumstances of a particular age; long since effete and dead, because the political ascendancy of Rome in Western Europe has long disappeared. (b) Besides, it is a matter of fact that this realm of England has never been included by any act of the Universal Church within the Roman Patriarchate. Up to the time of S. Augustine the monk (596) the British metropolitans were "autocephalous," *i. e.* ecclesiastically independent of any foreign patriarch. The Roman missionary was plainly told by the Abbot of Bangor that the Churches of

Britain "owed no other obedience to the Pope of Rome than they did to every godly Christian." And all subsequent encroachments of the Roman See on English ground were so far from according with the judgment of the Catholic Church that they were a distinct infringement of a Canon passed at the 3rd General Council (*Ephesus*, 431): "No Bishop shall occupy another province which has not been subject to him from the beginning...lest under pretext of sacerdocy the pride of power should creep in, and thus we should, little by little, lose the freedom which JESUS CHRIST, the Liberator of all men, has purchased for us with His own Blood¹."

4. **Royal Supremacy in the English Church.** Is then the Church of England, being thus *autocephalous*, also *acephalous*? Has she no supreme visible Head? In the Roman sense of supremacy, *none*. She is a Branch of the Catholic Church to which Holy Scripture assigns no Head but CHRIST. But as a national Church she is subject to the "chief government" of the reigning monarch. For the extent of this government the XXXVIIIth Article refers us to the Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth (1559). Those Injunctions lay claim only to such authority as "was of ancient time due to the Imperial crown of this Realm, *i.e.* under God to have the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born within these...realms, dominions and countries, of what estate either ecclesiastical or temporal soever they be, so as no sovereign power shall or ought to have any superiority over them²." In 1536, indeed, both Houses of Convocation had acknowledged Henry VIII. as "Supreme Head of the Eng-

¹ On the whole subject of Papal Supremacy the reader will do well to consult Mr Burgon's *Letters from Rome*, pp. 384—420.

² Sparrow's *Collection*, p. 83.

lish Church and Clergy, *in such sense as the law of Christ allowed the title.*" But the saving clause left Convocation uncompromised as to the extent of the Royal Supremacy; and happily for the Church, Queen Elizabeth withdrew the claim¹ which Henry had advanced. In the room of her father's Act of Supremacy which had been cancelled under Philip and Mary, she was content to substitute an act which accorded to her the *supreme governorship* of the English Church. And that this governorship is simply civil, that it embraces no part of the power of the keys, is clear from the explanatory Injunctions cited above.

A royal supremacy thus limited and defined, is in accordance at once with Holy Scripture, with ancient precedent, and with the practice of other non-Roman branches of the existing Catholic Church. Compare for the first, the sort of supremacy exercised over the Levitical priesthood by the Kings of Judah²: for the second, the extensive influence exerted over the Catholic Church by Christian Emperors, who not unfrequently convened and presided over General Councils, nominated Bishops, and heard clerical appeals³. And for the third, we are supported by the example of the orthodox Russian and Greek Churches: which, acknowledging no Head of the Visible Church but JESUS Christ our Lord, admit the general supremacy of the Crown in terms nearly equivalent to those accepted by ourselves⁴.

¹ Cf. Juel. Ep. xiv. ad Bulling.

² Cf. (*e.g.*) 1 Chron. xv. 12, xxiii. 6; 2 Chron. viii. 14, 15, xv. 8, 9, xvii. 7, 9. &c. (Bp. Browne, *Articles*, p. 798, note.)

³ See Pusey, *On the Royal Supremacy*, especially pp. 22, 32, 140-1.

⁴ Compare Döllinger, *Church and the Churches*, pp. 129, 132. The practical difficulties which have arisen with regard to the exercise of the Royal Supremacy in the English Church

§ ii. *Of Infallibility.*

1. **Nature of the Roman Claim.** It is yet an open question in the Roman Church where her supposed infallibility resides. All are agreed that no ordinary Priest or Bishop, no particular Branch of the Church is safe from error. It remains that this privilege must belong either (*a*) to General Councils, or (*b*) to the Pope speaking *ex cathedrâ* or (*c*) to the combined voice of a General Council and a Pope, i.e. to the decisions of General Councils after they have received the Papal assent. Between these three theories opinion is divided. On what principle (*c*) rests it is difficult to conceive: for if Councils and Popes are separately fallible, it is hard to see how the combination of two fallible elements can produce infallibility¹. With regard to (*a*) it is enough to answer that no *General* Council has been possible since the disunion of the East and West. There remains (*b*) the official infallibility of the Pope. *Bellarmino* propounded that "the Pope when he exercises his office of teaching the whole Church in matters pertaining to faith...[or] in precepts of morals which relate to things necessary to salvation...can by no possibility err." He even adds, that "it is a pious belief that no Pope can in his private character be a heretic, i. e. persistently hold anything contrary to the true faith²." Modern Ultramon-

are beside the present question. To many it will seem that the present jurisdiction of the Crown in ecclesiastical causes is in excess of the authority claimed by the Injunctions of Elizabeth (cf. Pusey, *R. S.* pp. 14, 15). The evil is increased by the growing influence of a House of Commons which is now open to the avowed enemies of the Anglican Church and of Christianity itself (Bp. Browne, *On the Articles*, pp. 801-2). But these are matters of internal interest, which in no way affect our position with regard to Papal usurpation.

¹ Faber, *Diff. of Romanism*, pp. 31, 32.

² *Dè Rom. Pontif.* IV. 3, 5, 6.

tanens have carried this belief so much further, that they seem to hold the perpetual inspiration of the Roman Bishop, almost “a quasi hypostatic union of the Holy Ghost with each successive Pope¹.” Papal Encyclicals have been held to be “the very word of God².” The present Pope has practically allowed the claim by adding a new doctrine to the Christian Faith³, and is believed—whether rightly or wrongly the next few years may shew,—to be awaiting an opportunity for decreeing this most extreme view to be “of faith.”

2. **Grounds of Roman Infallibility.** It is not pretended that the Roman claim is of primitive origin. It may be well to add that it is distinctly opposed to primitive testimony. Let the following passage from *S. Augustine* suffice. Writing against the Donatists he complains, “You are ever throwing in our teeth Cyprian’s letters, Cyprian’s opinion, Cyprian’s Council” ...adding “Who knows not that the Canonical Scripture of the Old and New Testaments is contained within certain limits, and that its authority is so far to be preferred to all the later letters of Bishops that no question can be raised whether what is found written therein be true and right: whereas the letters of Bishops written after the settling of the canon may be checked by the wiser language of any writer who happens to be more fully acquainted with the facts, or by the weightier authority of other Bishops and the skill of learned men, or by Councils. And particular or provincial Councils again must yield to the authority of general Councils gathered from the whole Christian world: nay, earlier General Councils may themselves be corrected by later⁴.”

¹ Pusey, *Eirenicon*, p. 326-7.

² Pusey, *E.* 304.

³ See Archbp. Manning’s Pastoral (cited by Pusey, p. 327).

⁴ *De Baptismo contr. Donat.* II. 3.

Nor can it easily be shown that, as matter of history, former Popes or Roman Catholic Councils have always proved themselves infallible. The Council of Trent will certainly not answer to the test in the opinion of any sincere Anglican. Later Popes have arrived at decisions distinctly contrary to those of their predecessors: a Pope has even been known to retract his own earlier judgment¹.

The only substantial argument in favour of the Roman claim, in whatever form it is put, rests upon the promises made in Holy Scripture to the Universal Church. But this reasoning assumes that the Roman Church, together with the Churches in communion with her, is identical with the Church Catholic. And this assumption again rests on another, viz. that the Roman Church, as inheriting the jurisdiction of S. Peter, is the Mother and Mistress of all Churches. Consequently, if it has been shown that no supremacy was given by our Lord to S. Peter or delegated by S. Peter to the Bishop of Rome, the infallibility of Rome has been sufficiently disproved. It vanishes together with her supremacy.

3. Infallibility of the Catholic Church. It may be well in conclusion to analyse the grounds on which infallibility is claimed for the Church Catholic. They are, principally (1) Our Lord's promises in S. Matth. xvi. 18 and xxviii. 20: "The Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it (= My Church.)" "I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." (2) S. Paul's words in 1 Tim. iii. 15: "The House of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the Truth²."

¹ Scudamore, *England and Rome*, 410—425. Cf. Pusey, *Eiren.* 305—318.

² Cf. Bp. Ellicott (*Comm. on Past. Epistles*, p. 51), who speaks of these words as "defining with indirect allusion to

From these texts it seems to be legitimately inferred (a) that the Church is the Divinely appointed depositary of the Faith, (b) that as a whole she can never fail, and therefore (c) that as a whole she can never lose the possession of any doctrine or practice essential to her existence. So far the promise has been verified by the history of eighteen centuries. But what assurance does either Scripture or experience afford of the inerrancy of any particular officer in the Church, of any particular branch of the Church, of any particular representative assembly of the Church, or of any majority of individual members of the Church at any one time living upon earth?

Yet there have been utterances of the Church's voice to which such passages of Holy Scripture do certainly seem to promise security from error. At least, to use the well-known words of *Vincentius Lirinensis*, "in the Catholic Church we must especially be careful to maintain that which has been believed EVERYWHERE, ALWAYS and BY ALL, for this is truly and properly Catholic¹." Such are, probably, the doctrinal decisions of at least the first four Councils, ratified as they have been by the consentient voice of Eastern and Western Christendom during more than fourteen centuries.

It is impossible to believe that the promised Presence of our Lord can have had so little practical effect on the destinies of the Church as to be com-

nascent and developing heresies (see ch. IV. 1 sq.), the true note, office, and vocation of the Church; 'the Apostle calls her *the pillar and basis*, inasmuch as it would appertain to her to possess within herself the whole body of the Truth.' Theodorus." This is no more than the 'witnessing and keeping' of Article xx.

¹ His words are, "In ipsâ Catholicâ Ecclesiâ magnopere curandum est, ut id teneamus quod ubique quod semper quod ab omnibus creditum est; hoc est enim vere propriè catholicum." (*Commonit.* I. 3.)

patible with error in essentials of faith and practice *universally and persistently maintained*. Perhaps it would be safe to hold that in general the chance of error diminishes in proportion to the catholicity and antiquity of the tenet. Certainly such a belief in the preservative power of our Lord's Presence over the Creed of Universal Christendom in no way involves the theory of Papal or indeed of Roman infallibility.

CHAPTER V.

OF THE CONDITION OF THE FAITHFUL DEAD.

CHURCH OF ROME.

"If any one saith that after the gift of justification has been received, to every penitent sinner the guilt is remitted and the debt of eternal punishment is blotted out in such wise that there remains not any debt of temporal punishment to be discharged either in this world or in the next, in Purgatory, before the entrance to the kingdom of Heaven can be opened (to him); let him be anathema."—Co. of Trent, Sess. VI. Canon xxx.

"For those who are departed in Christ and who are not yet fully purified, it [the Sacrifice of the Mass] is rightly offered, agreeably to a tradition of the Apostles."—Ib. Sess. XXII. c. ii.

"Whereas the Catholic Church, instructed by the Holy Ghost, has from the sacred writings and the ancient tradition of the fathers taught in the sacred Councils and very

CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

"We bless thy Holy Name for all thy servants departed this life in Thy faith and fear."—Order for Holy Communion.

"Receive him [i. e. a dying child] into those heavenly habitations where the souls of them that sleep in the Lord JESUS enjoy perpetual rest and felicity."—Order for Visitation of the Sick.

"Almighty GOD, with whom do live the spirits of them that depart hence in the Lord, and with whom the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity... hasten thy kingdom, that we with all those that are departed in the true faith of thy Holy Name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in thy eternal and everlasting glory."—Order for the Burial of the Dead.

recently in this Œcumenical Synod that there is a purgatory¹, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the Faithful, but principally by the acceptable Sacrifice of the altar; this holy Synod enjoins on Bishops that they diligently endeavour that the sound doctrine concerning purgatory transmitted by the Holy Fathers and sacred Councils be believed, maintained, taught and everywhere proclaimed by the faithful of Christ.”—*Ib.* Sess. XXV.

“The power of conferring indulgences was granted by Christ to the Church, and she has even in the most ancient times used the said power, delivered unto her by God.”—*Ib.* Sess. XXV. c. xxi.

“The Romish Doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons (de indulgentiis) ... is a fond thing (res futilis) vainly invented and founded on no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God.”—Article XXII.

“The Sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.”—Article XXXI.

1. Testimony of Scripture as to the Present State of the Dead. The orthodox Jews of our Lord’s time believed in a present condition of reward and punishment, in which the souls of the departed await the Resurrection². This belief was abundantly sanctioned

¹ Bellarmine’s definition of Purgatory is as follows: “Purgatory is a certain place wherein, as in a prison, souls are purified after this life—such souls as in this life have not been fully purified; in order that they may thus obtain an entrance into Heaven whither nothing unclean shall enter” (*De Purgat.* I. I.)

² Josephus represents the Pharisees as believing that “souls possess an immortal vigour, and that under ground there are punishments and rewards dispensed to those who in their lifetime practised vice or virtue: that to the one an everlasting imprisonment is assigned, while to the other is given the power of returning to life.” The Sadducees, on the other hand, supposed the existence of soul to terminate with that

by our Lord and His Apostles. In Hades, according to the teaching of the New Testament, there are two abodes, separated by an impassable Gulf : one a place of torment (S. Luke xvi. 28), the other known as 'Abraham's Bosom' (S. Luke xvi. 22), or 'Paradise' (S. Luke xxiii. 43), a state of blessed rest (Rev. xiv. 13) and intimate communion with Christ (2 Cor. v. 6 ; Phil. i. 23). Here the spirits of the righteous dwell, perfected (Heb. xii. 23) and freed from the burden of mortality (2 Cor. v. 4), yet expecting in common with the saints on earth the complete adoption, viz. the redemption of the body (Rom. viii. 23 ; 1 Cor. xv. 52).

2. **Testimony of the Early Church.** "If we need the assistance of the ancient Fathers in this business, behold they be here ready with full buckets in their hands" (Usher¹). Their language closely reflects the revelations of Scripture. Thus *Justin Martyr* writes : "The souls of good men remain in a better, of bad men in a worse place, awaiting the time of judgment²." *Tertullian* : "We wrong Christ when we impatiently deplore the loss of our friends whom he has called out of this life, as if they needed our compassion³." *S. Irenæus* : "Each class of persons receive an appropriate place of abode, even before the judgment⁴." *S. Cyprian* : "It is for him to fear death that is not willing to go to Christ..... Simeon said, 'Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace,' &c., showing and attesting thereby that the servants

of the body (*Antiq.* XVIII. i. 3, 4). Lightfoot (*Hor. Hebr. in Luc. xvi.*) shews that the abodes of the righteous between death and resurrection were described by the Jews under such names as "the Garden of Eden," "under the Throne of glory," "in Abraham's bosom."

¹ *Answer to a Jesuit*, p. 163. See the citations at full, *ib.* pp. 164—170.

² *Dialog.* p. 223.

³ *De patientiâ*, c. 9. ⁴ II. 63.

of God then have peace, then enjoy a free and peaceful rest..... The righteous are called to refreshment, the unjust to punishment ; safety is speedily granted to the faithful, punishment to the faithless... Let us therefore hail the day which brings each of us to his own home ; which, taking us away from hence and loosing us from the snares of this world, restores us to Paradise and to the kingdom of heaven¹." *S. Ambrose*: "Death is a certain haven to them who being tossed in the great sea of this life desire a road of calm safety : it makes not a man's state worse, but what it finds in everyone that it reserves till the future judgment... When that day comes, let us go without fear to JESUS our Redeemer and to the council of the Patriarchs, to Abraham our Father, to the assembly of Saints and congregation of the just²." Again, the Fathers are exceedingly explicit on the impossibility of a moral or spiritual change after death. Witness an early writer under the name of *S. Clement*, Bishop of Rome : "While we are on earth let us repent..... For after our departure out of this world we can no more confess or repent in another³." *S. Cyprian* : "When once we have departed hence there is no more place for repentance, no longer any effectual satisfaction..... To him who believes, a saving pardon is granted out of the Divine pity ; and in the very moment of death the soul passes to immortality⁴." *S. Gregory Nazianzen*: "After the night of this life is past, there is no more purging [of sins]." "It is better now to be chastised and purified than in that world to be

¹ *De mortalitate*, § 2. II, 18.

² *De bono mortis*, c. 4—12.

³ *Ad Cor.* II. § 8. The 2nd Epistle is probably spurious ; but it was known and used in the time of Eusebius, *H. E.* III. 38.

⁴ *Opp.* I. p. 196.

sent to torment, when it is the season for punishment and not for purification¹."

3. **Early Christian Prayers for the Dead.** Yet all the Ancient Liturgies or Eucharistic Offices contain prayers for the faithful departed. The following are examples²: "Remember, O Lord God of the spirits and of all flesh the orthodox, whether commemorated by us or not, from righteous Abel to this present day: cause Thou them to rest in the land of the living, in thy kingdom, in the delights of Paradise, in the bosom of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob" (*Liturgy of S. James*). "Let us pray.....for those who are at rest in the faith" (*Liturgy of S. Clement*). "Remember all who have fallen asleep in the hope of the resurrection to eternal life" (*Liturgy of S. Basil*). "We offer unto Thee this reasonable service for those who are at rest in the faith, our forefathers, fathers, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Preachers, Evangelists, Martyrs, Confessors, Religious Persons, and every righteous spirit perfected in the faith, especially for our lady the holy, immaculate, most blessed, and glorious mother of God Mary Ever Virgin... ..Remember also all who have fallen asleep in hope of the resurrection to eternal life, and give them rest where the light of thy countenance shines³" (*Liturgy of S. Chrysostom*). The earliest mention of this practice is found in Tertullian. In the 4th century S. Augustine witnesses that "the whole Church was accustomed to pray for the dead," and S. Epiphanius warmly reproves the heretic Aetius for refusing to conform to the general practice. "The Church," he says, "doth necessarily perform

¹ *Oratt.* 42. 15.

² For the originals, see Dr Neale's *Primitive Liturgies*, pp. 67, 106.

³ *De Coron. Mil.* 3.

this rite, having received it by tradition from the fathers¹."

Holy Scripture however contains no directions upon the subject. A solitary example of prayer for a dead person has been produced from 2 Tim. i. 16—18; but the passage is at least ambiguous. Under these circumstances the English Reformers felt themselves at liberty in 1552 to expunge from our public services a class of petitions which was supported by no clear sanction of the Apostolic age, and which had become the occasion of many gross superstitions². On the other hand the Anglican branch of the Church has never authoritatively condemned the primitive practice³; whilst she has retained in her Eucharistic and Burial Offices a thankful commemoration of the departed and a general prayer for the consummation of the blessedness which awaits all the faithful, living or dead.

4. **Their Purpose and Meaning.** But whatever may be thought of the omission of prayer for the dead from the English Liturgy, it is at least certain that the

¹ *Heres.* 75.

² The reader should by all means consult a sermon in Bp. Ellicott's *Destiny of the Creature* (Serm. VI. pp. 140—144, and notes *j* and *k*).

³ The Homily "concerning Prayer" (pt. 3) asks, "Where is the third place which they call Purgatory? or where shall our prayers help and profit the dead?...Neither let us dream any more that the souls of the dead are anything at all holpen by our prayers...Let us not therefore dream either of purgatory or of prayer for the souls of them that be dead." It is to be remembered, however, (1) that the Homilies (with the exception of the Homily of Salvation) are not of symbolical authority, and (2) that the prayers for the dead condemned in the above quotation are prayers for souls supposed to be in purgatory. The writer does not seem to have had in view the primitive practice of praying for souls known or believed to be in Paradise.

early Catholic usage lends no sort of encouragement to "the Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory." For *prayers were anciently offered for souls which were believed to be at the time in perfect rest, and for saints of the greatest eminence, including the Blessed Virgin herself, whom no Roman Catholic could for a moment suppose to stand in need of deliverance from purgatorial flames.*

What then was the purpose which the early Catholic Church sought to answer by her prayers for the blessed dead? The question has been fully discussed by Archbishop Usher (*Answer to an Irish Jesuit*, pp. 191-2). He divides such commemorations into (1) Prayers of *thanksgiving*; (2) Prayers of *deprecation and petition*. The first call for no remark; they are offered by the Anglican Church as well as by the Roman. The second class consists of petitions that the dead may (a) partake in the Resurrection Glory, (b) obtain a favourable sentence at the last day, and (c) meanwhile enjoy continual rest in Paradise. Such requests were based on (1) the uncertainty of our knowledge as to the condition of individual souls before the final day of judgment¹, (2) the reasonableness of praying even for things that shall certainly come to pass so long as they are yet future²,

¹ So manifestly inconsistent were such prayers for the dead with the novel doctrine of Purgatory, that they were in some instances *altered* by a later age into prayer that the living might enjoy the intercession of the saints in glory. Thus a prayer in the old Roman missal for the soul of Pope Leo was changed into the following: "Grant, O Lord, that this oblation be of advantage to us through the intercession of S. Leo" (Bingham, *Antiq.* II. 778).

² *e. g.* in the Lord's Prayer we are taught to say, "Thy kingdom come," adding immediately, "For Thine is the kingdom." The advent of GOD's kingdom is as certain as His own existence, and yet it is a fit subject for prayer.

(3) the expediency of keeping alive in the minds of surviving Christians a sense of undivided communion with the dead in Christ.

5. **Rise of the Romish Doctrine.** By her use of prayer for the dead, the Church gave no sanction to any belief in a Purgatorial Fire. There were, however, sundry private opinions afloat even in the first ages which tended towards such a speculation. Thus, *Tertullian*, after he became a Montanist, entertained the idea that slight offences might be expiated by a delay in the resurrection of the offender ; *i.e.* by his loss of a place in the first resurrection¹. With *Origen* the pains of the lost assumed a purgative character : he thought it possible that their sins might at length be expiated by the fire through which they would pass. *S. Augustine* (on 1 Cor. iii. 11—15) considers it not incredible that “some of the faithful, by a purgatorial fire, are saved more or less speedily according as they have loved perishing goods with less or more of sinful affection.” This fire is, however, in his view, connected with the judgment of the last day—a purgatory immediately preceding the end of all things, and not already in operation. Besides, it is with him a mere theory, not an article of the faith. “The first whom we find directly to have held that for certain light faults there is a purgatory fire provided before the day of judgment was *Gregory the First*, about the end of the Sixth Age after the birth of our Saviour Christ².” The superstitious ignorance of the centuries which followed served to illustrate the new doctrine with legends of apparitions from the spirit world : and the schoolmen, especially Thomas Aquinas, gave form and shape to these wild fancies. Yet at the Council of Basle (1438) the representatives of the Greek Church

¹ *De Anima*, 35.

² Usher, p. 175.

presented a formal "Apology," in which they declared that "they had not received from their doctors, neither did the Eastern Church to their knowledge maintain, the doctrine of a temporal or purgatorial fire." Five years later, at Florence, the Greek Bishops were induced to concede the point: but their decision was reprobated by all the Patriarchs of the East, which continues to this day free from a belief in Purgatory. On the other hand, the doctrine was in the next century stereotyped as that of the Roman Church by the decrees of the Council of Trent, A.D. 1563.

6. **Argument from Scripture.** It has been shewn that the Romish Doctrine of Purgatory was not known to primitive antiquity. There remains the question, Was it known to our Lord and His Apostles? has it any sanction in Scripture? Can it be either expressly proved or reasonably inferred from any passage in either Testament? The Council of Trent claims this sanction (see citations) without referring to any particular passage. Cardinal Bellarmine has, however, supplied the deficiency by producing *ten* proofs out of the Old Testament and *nine* out of the New¹. Of the quotations from the Old Testament, it is enough to say that they bear witness to the ingenuity of the controversialist rather than to the goodness of his cause. The single exception to this remark is a passage from 2 Macc. (xii. 42—45) which speaks of a 'reconciliation made for the dead that they might be delivered

¹ Lest it should be supposed that any of these are withheld on account of their relevancy to the question, the reader is presented with the entire list. (1) *Proofs of Purgatory from the Old Testament*: 2 Macc. xii. 42; Tobit iv. 17; 1 Sam. xxxi. 10; (2 Sam. i. 12, vii. 35); Ps. xxxviii. 1, lxvi. 12; Is. iv. 4, ix. 18; Micah vii. 8, 9; Zech. ix. 11; Mal. iii. 3. (2) *Proofs from the New Testament*: S. Matt. v. 22, 25, 26 (S. Luke xii. 59); xii. 32; S. Luke xvi. 9, xxiii. 42; Acts ii. 24; 1 Cor. iii. 12, xv. 29; Phil. ii. 10; (Apoc. v. 3).

from sin.' This proves, indeed, that the Jews of the Maccabean period believed in remission of sins after death, but not that their tradition was a true one; the books of Maccabees being of the class which, as S. Jerome says, "the Church doth not apply to establish any doctrine¹." On the other hand, the fact of the first trace of a belief in Purgatory being found in a Jewish tradition is in itself suspicious, when it is remembered that our Lord scarcely mentioned the traditions of the Jews but to condemn them.

Of the New Testament citations only one deserves serious notice. In 1 Cor. iii. 12—15, S. Paul teaches, "Other foundations can no man lay than that is laid, which is JESUS Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble: every man's work shall be made manifest, for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon he shall receive a reward: if any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss, but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire."

Now, on Bellarmine's own showing, this is one of the most difficult passages in S. Paul's writings, and one which has been variously interpreted by Fathers of unquestioned authority. A doctrine which mainly rests on a particular interpretation of so ambiguous a text must be of at least precarious authority.

Further, the interpretation which favours a belief in Purgatory is inconsistent with S. Paul's words. The fire spoken of is that of "the day," *i.e.* according to the general usage of the Apostles, the Great Day of Christ's coming (Romans xiii. 12; 1 Thess. v. 2—4;

¹ Vid. *supra*, ch. i. § 3.

2 S. Peter iii. 10). But the fire of Purgatory is supposed to be antecedent to that day. Moreover, S. Paul's fire is not purgatorial, but probationary: it does not expiate sin, but consumes the sinner. The real key to the passage appears to lie in verses 10 and 16. The Church is represented as a temple built upon Christ; the Christian clergy are the builders, their flocks the stones of the spiritual building. The Day of Judgment will try the worth and permanence of all conversions to the faith. The "flaming fire" in which the Lord shall be revealed (2 Thess. i. 7) will consume the "wood, hay, stubble," *i.e.* all unsound members of the Church; while the pastor to whose want of vigilance their ruin was due will lose the reward of his ministerial work (1 Thess. ii. 19). His building will be burnt, however he may himself escape as a brand from the burning. In all this there is not a trace of Tridentine Purgatory.

Of so little worth are the Cardinal's Scripture proofs. He has ransacked the Bible, and produced but two passages of any importance; one from an apocryphal book, the other of doubtful interpretation; neither of the two at all equal to the burden imposed upon them. Against him are arrayed all the testimonies of God's Word to the blessedness of the Christian dead, and their immediate passage from this world into Paradise: all its assurances of present and complete remission of sin through the Blood of Christ (S. John v. 24, Ephes. i. 7, iv. 32, Heb. x. 14, 1 S. John i. 7¹). The "Romish Doctrine concerning Purgatory" has the

¹ "The only purgatory wherein we must trust to be saved is the Death and Blood of Christ, which if we apprehend with a true and stedfast faith, it purgeth and cleanseth us from all our sins."—*Homily conc. prayer*, pt. 3. See also a good summary of the Scriptural reasons against Purgatory in Bp. Beveridge *On the Articles*, XXII. pp. 401-2.

double demerit of being both an addition to the Faith once for all delivered to the saints, and a virtual contradiction of two of its leading truths¹.

7. **Indulgences.** In the early Catholic Church there was lodged in the hands of the bishops the power of shortening the season of penance, when the offender shewed signs of contrition, or at the approach of death. Such a remission of ecclesiastical censures was called an *Indulgence*. It is curious to trace the process by which this perfectly legitimate exercise of episcopal authority was converted into its Tridentine form. In the eighth century it became usual to accept from persons liable to Church discipline a pecuniary composition in lieu of penance². Next, a belief sprang up that all dispensing power of this kind was vested solely in the See of Rome. The Popes, once endued with so enormous an engine of power, did not fail to turn it to account. An indulgence proclaimed by Urban II. supplied fuel to the first

¹ The following quotation from Sir T. More's *Supplication of Souls* (Forbes, II. p. 309) will serve to convey some notion of the popular view of Purgatory prevalent at the time of the Reformation. *Loq.* a soul in Purgatory :

"If ye pity the poor, therè is none so poor as we, that have not a bratte to put upon our backs. If ye pity the blind, there is none so blind as we, &c.... Finally, if ye pity any man in pain, never knew ye pain comparable to ours : whose fire as far passeth in heat all the fires that ever burned on earth, as the hottest of all that passed a feigned fire painted on a wall."

It appears that the comparative reticence of the Tridentine Fathers has not been successful in restraining the imaginations of ordinary Roman Catholics. The "traveller as he passes from Germany into Italy" [*i. e.* as he approaches to the heart of Roman Catholicism] is appalled by "terrible representations of the holy souls in flames," which are in fact "the predominant subject" of Italian road-side art (Forbes, II. p. 307).

² Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v. 189.

Crusade¹. Then followed, in the 12th century, the invention of the doctrine of works of Supererogation (*supr.* III. § 2, 4); whilst in the 15th the dogma of Purgatory was synodically established by the Council of Florence². The 16th century opened with a bull of Alexander VI. authoritatively proclaiming the power of the Pope to remit, out of the treasures of merit committed to his charge, the punishment of souls in Purgatory. Finally, Leo X. consummated the work of transformation by replenishing his exhausted coffers with the promiscuous sale of indulgences, which promised remission of future purgatorial pains to the living, as well as the release of souls already imprisoned. The results of this final prostitution of spiritual power are known to every reader. The baseness of Tetzl awoke the fiery zeal of Luther (A.D. 1517); the sale of indulgences gave birth to the German Reformation. The Council of Trent, alarmed at the damaging exposures of the Reformers, abolished "all evil gains" connected with the dispensation of Papal indulgences. But it retained indulgences themselves, and boldly asserted that they are identical as well as synonymous with the primitive remissions of ecclesiastical penalties. Thus the Church of Rome to this day stands com-

¹ "The Bull of the Crusade against the Saracens (A. D. 1118) ran in these terms: 'And since ye have determined to expose both yourselves and the things belonging to you to the most extreme perils, if any of you, having accepted the penance for your sins, shall die in the expedition, we, by the merits of the saints and by the prayers of the whole Catholic Church absolve him from the chain of his sins.'" Bp. Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 358.

² "It is now conceded that 'until the end of the 15th century there was scarcely any, or anyhow very rare use of Indulgences for the departed.'"—Dr Pusey, *Eirenicon*, p. 202. Cf. pp. 198—205.

mitted to the *principle* which the doctrine of “pardons” involves.

Indulgences, in the sense in which they are condemned by the Anglican Church, are dispensed to souls already suffering or about to suffer purgatorial pains. Hence, if purgatory be a figment, ‘pardons’ are fictitious also¹; a punishment which does not exist cannot be remitted.

8. Masses for the Dead. Another, and the principal, supposed means of lessening the sufferings of souls in purgatory, is the offering of the mass, or “Sacrifice of the Altar,” on behalf of the dead. For an examination of the grounds on which the propitiatory character of the Holy Eucharist is thought to rest, see Chap. IX. § 3 (*Of the Eucharistic Sacrifice*).

¹ That pardons, however fictitious, are not with the Church of Rome a thing of the past, is only too capable of proof. Take (*e.g.*) the following instances from Mr Burgon’s *Letters from Rome*: “An indulgence of 9 years, *applicable to souls in purgatory*, is granted to all who with a contrite heart perform that ascent [of the *Scala Santa*], praying as they go and meditating on the Passion of our Lord.” Again, “Under this image of ‘*Maria santissima del Parto*,’ you read—‘*N. S. Pio PP. vii. concede in perpetuo 100 giorni d’ indulgenza da lucrarsi una volta il giorno da tutti quelle che divotamente baceranno il piede di questa immagine, recitando un Ave Maria per li bisogni di S. Chiesa.*’”

CHAPTER VI.

OF THE OBJECTS OF RELIGIOUS WORSHIP.

CHURCH OF ROME.

"The holy Synod enjoins all Bishops...that agreeably to the usage of the Catholic and Apostolic Church...they especially instruct the faithful diligently concerning the intercession and invocation of saints; the honour paid to relics and the legitimate use of images: teaching them that the Saints who reign together with Christ offer up their own prayers to GOD for men; that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them, and to have recourse to their prayers, aid and help for obtaining benefits from God through His Son JESUS Christ our Lord Who is our alone Redeemer and Saviour... Also that the holy bodies of holy martyrs and of others now living with Christ...are to be venerated by the faithful... Moreover, that the images of Christ, of the Virgin Mother of GOD and of the other Saints are to be had and re-

CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

"The Romish doctrine concerning... worshipping and adoration, as well of images as of reliques, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture but rather repugnant to the word of GOD."
—Article XXII.

tained particularly in temples, and that due honour and veneration are to be given them ...But if any one shall teach or entertain sentiments contrary to these decrees, let him be anathema."—Co. of Trent, Sess. XXV.

"*Their intercession [that of Angels] is to be invoked because they always see God, and most willingly undertake the advocacy of our salvation assigned to them... We are also justified in inferring that by honouring the Saints who have slept in the Lord, by invoking their intercession, and venerating their sacred reliques and ashes, so far is the glory of GOD from being diminished that it is very much increased....As Christ the Lord and His most holy and most pure Mother and all the other saints having been endued with human nature bore the human form, it is not only not forbidden by this commandment¹ to paint and honour their images, but it has always been deemed a holy practice.... It is...lawful to have images in a church and to pay them honour and respect, as the honour which is paid to them is referred to their prototypes.*"—Catech. of the Co. of Trent, Pt. iii. Ch. ii.

The English Church acknowledges but One object of religious worship, the Blessed TRINITY. The

¹ *i. e.* Commandment I. (= II.).

Church of Rome offers religious worship, under certain restrictions, to many objects, animate and inanimate. This important difference of practice divides itself into three heads, relating to (1) the Invocation of Saints, (2) the veneration of Relics, (3) the devotional use of Images.

§ i. *The Invocation of Saints.*

1. **Romish doctrine.** The Saints whom the Church of Rome teaches her members to invoke are not *all* the faithful dead (many of whom are yet in purgatory and need the prayers of the living); but such as are already admitted to the beatific vision and reigning together with Christ; e.g. Apostles, martyrs and canonized persons¹. These glorified spirits, dwelling in the immediate Presence of GOD, are made acquainted with the petitions which are offered to them by the Church on earth; and their intercession, thus secured, “availeth much” with the Divine Majesty.

It will be observed that this theory assumes the four following positions: (1) That certain of the Saints are already in eternal glory, (2) that they intercede for the faithful on earth, (3) that they are made aware of petitions addressed to them by the faithful on earth, (4) that it is lawful to address them in prayer. We have simply to inquire: Are these positions separately capable of proof?

2. **Are any of the Saints “now reigning with Christ”?** This belief, the mainstay of the whole fabric, rests on an insecure foundation. Bellarmine

¹ Other saints, it seems, may be invoked *privately*, though not by the Church; presuming of course that there is good reason to believe that they have been admitted to the vision of God. Bellarmine, *De Sanct. Beat.* 1. 10.

indeed cites several passages of Scripture which affirm that the presence of Christ is enjoyed by such as depart in faith (S. Luke xxiii. 43, Phil. i. 23, Acts vii. 59); but these texts describe nothing more than the blessedness of all the just in an intermediate state (see p. 73); whilst Apoc. vii. 14, 15 (which he also quotes) is a prophecy of the glory which is to follow the resurrection. Moreover, Holy Scripture draws no distinction between the present condition of Apostles and martyrs and that of others who have died in faith. Nor is there any "unanimous consent of the Fathers" upon this question. Romanists themselves have confessed that "it was matter in controversy of old whether the souls of the Saints before the Day of Judgment did see God and enjoy the Divine Vision¹." Indeed the doctrine which the Roman Council of Florence pronounced *de fide* was stigmatised by Justin Martyr as that of an heretical sect who denied the Resurrection².

3. Do the Saints in glory intercede for us?

The next point involved in the invocation of Saints is the belief that they intercede with God on behalf of the Church militant. Now to this as a matter of private opinion, there seems to be no reasonable objection. It is true that the only warrant which it finds in Scripture lies in those passages which speak of the bond of sympathy connecting all the members of Christ's Body, living and dead. We know that we have the good will of departed saints: it is inferred that we have their prayers; yet we have no certain knowledge that it is so. Still the teaching of the Apostles does

¹ *e.g.* Franciscus Pegna ap. Usher, p. 389.

² *Dial. c. Tryph.* 307. *τισὶ λεγομένοις χριστιανοῖς...οἱ καὶ λέγουσι μὴ εἶναι νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν ἀλλὰ ἅμα τῷ ἀποθνήσκειν τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ἀναλαμβάνεσθαι εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν.*

not either condemn or oppose such an idea. Accordingly it was very generally held by the great lights of the early Church. "I deem," says Origen, "that all those fathers who fell asleep before us fight with us and help us by their prayers¹." "It will not be wrong to say that all the Saints departed, retaining love for those who are still alive, take care of their salvation and of them by their prayers and intervention with God²." Dying martyrs spoke with confidence of the intercession they would shortly be able to offer for their friends. The great preachers of the Catholic Church, as S. Gregory Nazianzen, and S. Chrysostom himself, stimulated the faithful with the thought of the prayers which the departed were presenting on their behalf to God. When Vigilantius, offended by the superstitious tendencies of his age, maintained the opposite view and denied that the dead could offer prayer for the living, he was met by S. Jerome with a warm retort. "Paul the Apostle," writes the zealous Father, "says that two hundred threescore and sixteen souls were granted to him in the ship; and after he has departed and begun to be with Christ shall he then close his mouth and be unable to utter a word for those who throughout the world believed on his Gospel³?".....But the authority even of S. Jerome is not competent, in the silence of Scripture, to erect a private opinion into an article of faith. And that which is not itself *de fide* is an insufficient basis for a practice which claims the assent of all the faithful on pain of anathema.

4. **Can the Saints in glory hear our prayers?** Granting that there are Saints who already "reign with Christ"; granting that they intercede for the Church on earth; can they hear our petitions? is it to

¹ *In Jos. Hom.* 16.

² *In Cant.* lii.

³ *c. Vigil.* n. 7.

any purpose to seek their intercession? Nothing short of a revelation can prove that the Saints in Heaven *have the power* to hear the prayers of men on earth. But no such revelation exists. "There is joy in heaven," we are told, "over one sinner that repenteth;" but this joy is "in the presence of the Angels of God," who are ministering spirits in continual communication with the Church militant on earth (S. Luke xv. 7, 10). To the spirits of just men Holy Scripture ascribes neither the ministry nor the knowledge of Angels. "We are come," it is true, to the fellowship of spirits both saintly and angelical in the communion of the Catholic Church¹, but this intercommunion implies no more knowledge of our words and thoughts on the part of departed saints than we possess of theirs. Neither does it follow from their supposed enjoyment of the Divine Vision. *Peter Lombard*², the Master of the Sentences, thought it "not incredible that the souls of the Saints, which in the secret of God's presence rejoice in the illumination of the True Light, do in the contemplation thereof understand the things that are done abroad." *Duns Scotus* rejected this account of the matter, preferring to believe that a special revelation is made to each Saint of the prayers addressed to him by the faithful on earth. *Bellarmino*, unable to decide between these solutions, leaves the manner uncertain, contenting himself with the observation that "the former is in itself the more probable, but the latter more serviceable for convincing heretics." To these mediæval conjectures it may be enough to answer in the words of the Anglican Homily "Concerning Prayer" (pt. 2). "As for the Saints, they have so little knowledge of the

¹ Heb. xii. 22, 23: προσελήλυθατε... μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων
...καὶ πνεύμασιν δικαίων τετελειωμένων.

² Cf. Usher, p. 404 seq.

secrets of the heart that many of the ancient Fathers greatly doubt whether they know anything at all that is commonly done on earth. And albeit some think they do, yet S. Augustine, a doctor of great authority and also antiquity, hath this opinion of them, that they know no more what we do on earth than we know what they do in Heaven. For proof whereof he allegeth the words of Isaiah the Prophet¹, where it is said, 'Abraham is ignorant of us and Israel knoweth us not.'" S. Augustine's words are as follows: "If such great Patriarchs as these were ignorant what was done towards the people that descended from them.....how can the dead be thought to concern themselves with knowing and furthering the affairs and actions of the living?...The spirits of the dead are there where they see not the things that are done or that occur to men in this present life." He concludes that "the dead know not what is done here, while it is in doing," although this knowledge may be afterwards communicated to them either by other spirits more recently departed, or by Angels, or by direct revelation of God, so much as it is necessary for them to know²." But from the certainty to which the divines of modern Rome have attained in this matter, S. Augustine with the rest of the early Fathers is many steps removed. Yet without this certainty it must be at least of doubtful advantage to invoke the aid of the dead.

5. **Is it lawful to address them in prayer?** This is a yet more serious question. Let it be assumed in the first instance that to invoke the Saints is nothing more than *prier pour prier*, to ask the prayers of the dead, as we are all accustomed to ask the prayers of the living. Yet even such invocation of departed spirits is wholly unauthorized,

¹ c. lxiii. 16.

² *De curâ pro mortuis*, c. 13—15.

and even opposed to the teaching of Scripture and the Early Church.

For (1) amongst all the prayers of Scripture, there is not a single petition, or anything approaching a petition, offered to a departed saint. The Romanist divines have sought to explain the absence of these invocations from the Old Testament by replying that the spirits of the patriarchs and prophets were not admitted to the Divine Vision—that they were in fact imprisoned in a region of Hades, technically known as *Limbus patrum*—until the descent of our Lord into Hell effected their deliverance. This is, of course, a mere conjecture¹; but, admitting it, there is still the silence of the New Testament to be accounted for. We read in the Acts of two instances of martyrdom: but of the subsequent invocation of S. Stephen or S. James not a line. The technical verb ‘invoke’ [ἐπικαλεῖσθαι] is frequently employed by the writers of the Acts and Epistles, but only in relation to God *and* Christ². S. Stephen died “invoking and saying, Lord JESUS, receive my spirit” (Acts vii. 59). The faithful are described by S. Paul as “all that in every place invoke the Name of our Lord JESUS Christ (1 Cor. i. 2). As early as the time of S. Paul’s conversion the baptized were already recognised both by friends and enemies as “invocators of Christ³.” Such passages have been held by the orthodox as a sufficient refutation of Arianism. If JESUS Christ (they have argued) were

¹ See Usher, *Answer &c.*, pp. 252—377, and Field, *of the Church*, bk. III. c. 16.

² The corresponding phrase in the Old Testament is קָרָא בְשֵׁם יְהוָה, cf. Gen. iv. 26 (Hebr. and LXX.). S. Paul assumes that invocation implies an act of faith towards the Person invoked (Rom. x. 14). But God is the only proper object of such faith.

³ οἱ ἐπικαλούμενοι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦτο, sc. τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. Cf. Acts ix. 14. 21.

not the true God, He would have been no fit object for the invocation of Christians, seeing that invocation is an act of homage due to God alone¹. (2) Invocation of Saints is equally unknown to the Ante-Nicene Church. Whatever views may have been held as to the probability of the Saints praying for us, the inference was never drawn that it is lawful to pray to them. There is a fine passage in Origen's reply to Celsus (64) which puts the primitive theory into marked contrast with that of Rome. "As the motion of the shadow follows the body when it is moved, in like manner when the favour of GOD is secured, the consequence is that one has the good-will of all His friends—angels, and souls, and spirits ;.....nor only their favour—they co-operate with those who wish to serve the God Who is above all and gain His favour, and unite in their prayers and petitions ; so that we may dare to say that with regard to men who deliberately prefer the better part *when they pray to God many myriads of holy powers pray with them UNCALLED*²." It is not till the end of the fourth century that this belief in the *uninvoked comprecation* of the Saints begins to give place to direct prayer for their intercession. The first recorded instances³ of invocation are said to occur in the writings of S. Gre-

¹ So *Origen* reasons (IV. p. 624): "If to invoke the name of the Lord and to adore GOD is one and the same thing, as Christ is invoked He is also to be adored."

² *Origen* evidently knew nothing of the later practice of asking for the intercession of Saints and Angels. In this same treatise he affirms that "every prayer, supplication, intercession, and thanksgiving is to be sent up to the supreme GOD through the High Priest who is above all Angels," adding that the Word of GOD, being Himself GOD, is also an object of worship. "We must pray only to the Supreme God and to his only-begotten Son."

³ Usher, *Answer &c.* p. 386.

gory Nazianzen. "Hear," he exclaims, "O soul of great Constantius, if thou hast any power of perception; and ye souls of kings who before him loved Christ." In a funeral oration pronounced in honour of his sister Gorgonia there is a similarly doubtful and tentative address to the departed spirit: "If thou hast any care for our estate, and saintly souls receive from God the reward of being permitted to have some perception of such things, accept this Oration." But these are mere flights of rhetoric, no more involving the Roman practice than the address to "the spirits and souls of the righteous," which has been retained by the English Church in her Order for Morning Prayer¹. More direct invocations, however, undoubtedly occur in other parts of S. Gregory's works: and also in those of S. Gregory's namesake the Bishop of Nyssa; S. Jerome and S. Chrysostom. The tendency was encouraged by the common practice of erecting churches over the graves of the martyrs or to their honour. At these *martyria* prayers were offered to God with especial reference to the intercession of the martyrs; and an easy transition led the suppliants to address the martyrs themselves. Miracles were believed to be wrought at these sacred spots: and it was inferred that the agents were either the spirits of the martyrs or angels acting in their place. Might not spirits who were present either personally or by deputy be invoked, not indeed as divine, but as potent intercessors with God²?

¹ "O ye spirits and souls of the righteous...O Ananias, Azarias, and Misael, bless ye the Lord, praise Him and magnify Him for ever." *Benedicite*. Cf. Daniel iii. (LXX).

² Martyrs were regarded as intercessors of especial power. "They bear," says S. Chrysostom, "the 'marks' of Christ; and exhibiting those marks they are able to persuade the king of all things."—*Hom. de Bernice et Prosdoco*.

(3) But besides the silence of Scripture and of the Church of the first three centuries another still more weighty objection lies against this practice. It tends to obscure the mediation and intercession of our Lord JESUS Christ. Of course this is denied by the Council of Trent, as it was denied by the first innovators in the matter. It is plausibly urged that to ask the intercession of dead saints is no more dishonouring to our Lord's sole Mediatorship than to ask the prayers of those who are yet alive. In both cases the intercession desired presupposes the mediation of Christ. He is our Advocate with the FATHER; the advocacy of Saints, alive or dead, is effectual only through His Sacrifice and Intercession. And of the lawfulness of employing human intercessors in this secondary sense, Scripture has not left us to doubt. Abimelech was healed at the prayer of Abraham (Gen. xx. 17); Job's friends were forgiven upon the request of the Patriarch (Job xlii. 8). The Centurion, whose faith was eulogised by our Lord, procured the healing of his servant through the intercession of the Jewish elders (S. Luke vii. 3)¹. S. Paul, it may be added, who was behind none of the Apostles in the emphasis which he laid upon the Mediatorship of Christ, continually mentions his own prayers on behalf of the Churches, or desires their prayers for himself.

But the *Ora pro nobis* of the Roman Church is more than a request for a fellow Christian's prayers. It is uttered with all the signs of religious homage: on bended knee, in places and at times of Divine Service, to the strains of solemn music, with as much fervour and frequency as *Per Jesum Christum Dominum Nostrum*. How utterly unlike to the mutual intercessions of S. Paul and the faithful are the modern Roman

¹ *Cat. of Co. of Trent*, Pt. III. c. ii. q. xiii.

litanies¹, which pass without break or pause from the worship of the Blessed TRINITY to supplicate the prayers of S. Mary, all the Apostles and Evangelists, all the holy Martyrs, all holy Bishops and Confessors and Doctors, Priests and Levites, Monks and Hermits, Virgins and Widows, Saints male and female; at least fifty of these being mentioned by name in as many separate petitions! Is it possible that these solemn and systematic invocations can fail to overshadow the mediatorship of our Saviour Christ, substituting many intercessors for the One, and so detracting from the honour of Him who is our only "way" to God; Who has said, "No man cometh to the FATHER but by Me"?

6. **Direct "cultus" of the Saints in the Church of Rome.** But the invocation of the Saints in the Roman Church does not stop even here. "As far as the words go" (writes Bellarmine²) "it is lawful to say 'S. Peter, have mercy upon me, save me &c.,' so that we understand 'save me and have mercy upon me by praying for me.'"... Sheltered by this sophistry (for a milder term would surely be out of place) the manuals of devotion in common use among the Romanists abound in direct appeals to the saints for help and grace. It is difficult to conceive of any petition being offered to GOD Himself which is not in this way offered to one of His creatures. Especially is this true with regard to prayers addressed to the blessed Virgin Mary. The following quotations from recognised forms of prayer may serve as specimens:

"We fly to thy patronage, O Sacred Mother of God³; despise not our prayers in our necessities, but

¹ Vide (e.g.) the Litany in *Rituale Romanum*, p. 104.

² *De Sanct. Beatitud.* 1. 17.

³ The Greek compound corresponding to this title of the Blessed Virgin [*θεοτόκος*, *Deipara*=she whose Son is GOD]

deliver us from all dangers, O glorious and blessed ever-Virgin."

"O glorious Virgin Mary, I commit my soul and body to thy blessed trust this night and for ever, but more especially at the hour of my death. I recommend to thy merciful charity all my hopes, my consolations, my distress and misery, my life and the end thereof."

Litany of our Blessed Lady of Loretto.

"Mother of Mercy, hope and comfort of dejected and desolate souls....take pity, I beseech thee, on my poverty and necessities; have compassion on my anxieties and cares; assist and comfort me in all my infirmities and miseries of what kind soever. Thou art the Mother of mercies, the sweet Consolatrix and only Refuge of the needy and the orphan, the destitute and afflicted. Cast therefore an eye of pity on a miserable forlorn child of Eve, and hear my prayer...Whither can I fly for more secure shelter...than under the wings of thy maternal protection?"

Thirty days' prayer to the Blessed Virgin Mary.

"Hail, Holy Queen, Mother of mercy, our Life, our sweetness and our Hope...turn, most gracious Advocate, thine eyes of mercy towards us."

"O glorious Queen of all the heavenly citizens, we

was used by Christian writers from the beginning of the fourth century without reproof, and at length received the formal sanction of the Church at the Council of Ephesus (431), which condemned Nestorius, Patriarch of Constantinople, for denying the correctness of the term. His denial was thought to proceed from unsound views as to the Person of Our Lord...The later Latin forms, *Dei genetrix*, *mater Dei*, are certainly open to a misconstruction of which *θεοτόκος* was incapable. Still they hardly go further than Elizabeth's "*mother of my Lord*;" and the disfavour into which the expression "*mother of God*" has fallen amongst ourselves is chiefly owing to its abuse by the Romanists. No well-taught Anglican will deny the Catholic truth embodied in *θεοτόκος*.

beseech thee accept this Rosary which...we offer at thy feet; and grant, most gracious Lady, that by thy intercession our souls may be influenced with so ardent a desire of seeing thee so gloriously crowned that it may never die in us until it shall be changed into the happy fruition of thy blessed sight."

Rosary of the B. V. M.

"Mary, Mother of grace, Mother of mercy, shield us from the Enemy, and receive us at the hour of death."

Ritual. Roman. de visitatione infirmorum.

This formula is provided by the Roman Church for the use of dying persons. It would seem to be the purpose of Rome to fix the last thoughts of the departing soul on the grace and mercy of a created advocate¹.

Still more decisive is the teaching which is propagated on this subject among members of the Roman communion by authorized and canonized instructors. Thus Liguori, in his treatise on "the Glories of Mary," has ventured to assert that "it is impossible for a client of Mary...to be lost;" that "it is the will of GOD that all graces should pass through her hands;" that "she is the source of all our good," "the Hope of all;" that

¹ As one might have expected, these expressions of devotion have been magnified in the popular religion of the Romish Church. The people are, if possible, before their priests in their worship of S. Mary. Cf. Burgon, *Letters from Rome*, pp. 102, 3: "Quite useless is it, worse than useless, for any to pretend to disguise the plain fact that the Mother of Our Lord is more than worshipped at Rome. Not only are the incommunicable attributes of the Creator eagerly transferred to the creature; but she is set *before* and *in place of* her Divine Son. She (not HE) is styled the "*unica spes peccatorum*." Her image (not HIS) meets you at the corner of every street...In the month of May the same honours are paid in Church to the Blessed Virgin which at other times are paid to Our Lord, and with far more enthusiasm."

“whom the justice of GOD saves not, the infinite mercy of Mary saves by her intercession:” finally, that she “has over GOD the authority of a mother¹.” The writer of these amazing blasphemies has since been ‘beatified’ by the Church of Rome. Nay, the present Pope, in the Encyclical of 1849, uses language scarcely less revolting². “The Blessed Virgin (he says)...being constituted between Christ and His Church...hath ever delivered the Christian people from calamities of all sorts...The whole of our confidence is placed in the most holy Virgin, since GOD has placed in Mary the fulness of all good, that accordingly we may know that if there is any hope in us, if any grace, if any salvation, it redounds to us from her, because such is His Will who hath willed that we should have everything through Mary.”

It may be pleaded that this teaching has not yet received the sanction of the Church in Council, and is therefore not *de fide*. How near even this final step may be, the year 1869, with its so-called “Œcumenical” Council of Rome, will probably shew. But whatever may be the doctrinal formulæ which will spring from the combined wisdom of the Bishop of Rome and his subordinates, the above extracts sufficiently shew the practical tendency of their system. Mariolatry in the Roman Church is not a superstition of the vulgar, not the morbid fancy of a party, but a leprosy which has spread itself over the entire body, until “from the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it.”

7. Romanist distinction of degrees of worship. That some kind of religious worship, over and above invocation, is paid in the Roman Church to saints and especially to the Blessed Virgin Mary, admits of no

¹ Liguori, *Glories*, &c. (Lond. 1852). ² *Ibid*, p. 123.

dispute. Accordingly Bellarmine and Romanist apologists after him endeavour to distinguish the worship paid to the Saints from that which belongs to God. There are, they say, three kinds of religious honour, technically called *douleia*, *hyperdouleia*, and *latreia* [δουλεία, ὑπερδουλεία, λατρεία]. The last and highest belongs to God alone: for it is written "Him only shalt thou serve" [λατρεύσεις = worship with *latreia*]. The first or lowest is due to glorified Saints. The second, a degree intermediate (as it seems) between the worship of the other Saints and the worship of God, is peculiar to the Blessed Virgin, as the mother of Our Lord.

Unhappily for this theory, (1) the word *douleia* in its religious sense is applied in Scripture only to the worship of the True God or of objects substituted by the errors of men for the One True God. Thus the evil are said to serve Mammon, or sin, or idols, or their own lusts (S. Matt. vi. 24, Rom. vi. 6, Gal. iv. 8, 9, Tit. iii. 3): the saints, on the other hand, are called to be *servants* [δούλοι] of God and His Son (Rom. vi. 22, vii. 25). Again and again the Apostles style themselves *servants* [δούλοι] of JESUS Christ (Rom. i. 1, &c., S. James i. 1, 2 S. Pet. i. 1, &c.), and correlatively He is described as their "Lord," their sovereign owner and master¹, because their GOD and Redeemer. But where does Scripture speak of "Our Lady"? Where do the Apostles profess themselves the "servants" of the Saints, except indeed of Saints yet alive (2 Cor. iv. 5), and then in a sense evidently alien from that of religious veneration? (2) The Early Church knew nothing of any religious worship belonging to the Saints. The

¹ Cf. Rom. xii. 11: τῷ Κυρίῳ δουλεύοντες. Καίρῳ, the reading of some of the MSS., is rejected by the best modern editors.

“cultus” which it offered them was nothing more than the tribute of reverence due to eminent sanctity. “We venerate the martyrs with that worship (*cultû*) of love and fellowship with which holy men of God are worshipped¹ even in this life...But with that true worship which is called in Greek *latreia*, but in Latin cannot be expressed by any single word, since it is a kind of service which peculiarly belongs to Deity, we neither worship nor teach men to worship any but God Alone².” Such was S. Augustine’s apology for the veneration paid to the martyrs in early times. Will the Romanist venture to say that the *douleia* which he offers to dead saints is no more than the *cultus* which the Bishop of Hippo was ready to pay even to the living? And as to *hyperdouleia*, the only anticipation of it in the early ages is to be found in the practice of the heretical sect condemned by S. Epiphanius as guilty of offering to the name of Mary on a certain day in the year cakes of a particular kind [*κολλυρίδες*, whence they were known as Collyridiani]³. The indignant refutation of the worthy Bishop deserves the attention of a Church which at this day offers to the Virgin the far more idolatrous sacrifice of Divine appellations and direct petitions. “The body of Mary was holy, I grant; yet she was not Divine...she was not given to us to be worshipped, but herself worshipped Him who was born of her after the flesh”..... “What Scripture has treated of this worship? which of the prophets permitted the worship of man, not to say of woman? for chosen as the vessel is, she is but a

¹ Cf. our title of “worshipful,” applied to civic magistrates, and the phrase in the Marriage Service, “With my body I thee *worship*.” So in the English Authorized Version of the Bible, the verb is occasionally used without the slightest idea of religious devotion. See S. Luke xiv. 10; Rev. iii. 9.

² *c. Faust*, XX. 21.

³ *Adv. Hæres.* LXXIV.

woman...Let Mary be held in honour, but let the FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST be worshipped; let no man worship Mary." (3) A verbal distinction is useless where there is no distinction in point of fact. Now the worship of God and the worship of the Saints in the Roman Church are practically all but identical. They are offered with the same manifestations of outward homage. The titles ascribed to S. Mary and the petitions asked of her are precisely the same as those which are offered to Our Lord JESUS Christ. (See above, p. 97)¹. (4) Holy Scripture positively discourages the offering of any mark of religious veneration to Saints, as being an invasion of the rights of God. Cornelius can hardly be suspected of having intended to worship S. Peter with *latreia*; yet when he fell on his knees before the Saint he was instantly raised by the First of the Apostles, with the rebuke, "Stand up; I myself also am a man"².

Again, supposing the *hyperdouleia* of the Blessed Virgin to have been contemplated by the Apostles as a consequence however remote of her relation to Our Lord, it is singular that her name is not mentioned or alluded to in any of the Apostolic Epistles, or in the Acts, excepting an incidental reference to her in ch. i. Even the Gospels are remarkably silent as to the words and acts of S. Mary. Four times only during Our Lord's ministry we find mention made by Him of His Mother, and on each of these occasions His words sound like a warning against any belief in the special efficacy of her intercession. Once He formally disclaims an attempt on her part to control the move-

¹ *Bellarmino* confesses that, "as to the outward acts, it is not easy to distinguish the different kinds of adoration; for nearly all the outward acts of devotion are common to every kind of adoration, excepting sacrifice and its accessories."

² Acts i. 25, 26. Cf. xiv. 14, 15.

ments of His Will, "What have I to do with thee¹?" Twice He asserts that they who do the Will of His FATHER, share in her nearness of relationship to Him; such an one is "His Mother²:" "yea rather, blessed are they that hear the Word of God and keep it³." Lastly, on the Cross He finally transfers to S. John His filial obligations⁴ to the "woman⁵" who had borne Him. Four such significant utterances from the lips of Him who knew all things, future as well as present, might well have been sufficient to check the progress of Roman Mariolatry, had men had "ears to hear" His Word. Nor does (a) the salutation of the Angel Gabriel or (b) the "*Magnificat*" of the Virgin herself⁶ modify this conclusion in the least degree. The translation of (a) by the Vulgate, "*Hail, full of grace,*" though incessantly repeated in the devotions of Romanists, has little support from the original: which probably amounts to no more than "accepted (with God)," or at the most, as our English Version has it, "highly favoured⁷." No Anglican, no well-taught Protestant, will deny that the Mother of Our Lord was "highly favoured." Nor will any true member of the Church of England hesi-

¹ S. Joh. ii. 4.

² S. Mark iii. 34.

³ S. Luke xi. 28.

⁴ S. Joh. xix. 26, 27.

⁵ Our Lord's repeated use of this term with reference to His mother, though perfectly consistent with respect and love—*γυνή* is "lady"—seems like a distinct disavowal of her maternal authority over His Messianic and high priestly acts.

⁶ S. Luke i. 28, 48.

⁷ The epithet is explained in verse 30, "thou hast found favour with God." Cf. Eph. i. 6, where the same verb occurs in the active voice. Even if *κεχαριτωμένη* is rightly rendered *gratiâ plena*, no inference can be drawn as to the Blessed Virgin's power to bestow or obtain grace for us. "Mary is not a dispenser of favour, but a *recipient* of it."—Stier, *Words of the Angels*, p. 23.

tate to fulfil (*b*) her own prophecy, by speaking of her as the "Blessed" Virgin. The "Song of the Blessed Virgin" retains its ancient place in the daily Service of the English Church. Two yearly festivals commemorate the honour which was put upon her at her "Annunciation" and "Purification." All the veneration which Scripture sanctions, which the ancient Catholic Church paid to her memory, is preserved amongst us. But the *hyperdouleia* of Rome we reject and detest as derogatory to the honour of GOD and of Christ, and to the spirit of the Blessed Virgin herself—*εἰ τις αἰσθησις*—infinitely painful and odious.

8. **Invocation of Angels.** Much that has been said with regard to the *cultus* of Saints applies to that of Angels. There are, however, special arguments bearing upon this branch of the subject which require to be handled separately. It is urged (*a*) that the Old Testament affords distinct instances of Angel worship. Jacob "entreats, nay compels, the Angel with whom he wrestled to bless him¹:" and elsewhere asks the blessing of the same Angel when invisible (Gen. xlviii. 16.) Compare Joshua v. 14. (*b*) That both Testaments represent the Angels as being our intercessors with God, as well as God's ministers to us. (Tobit xii. 12, 15, Apoc. v. 8, viii. 3, 4). (*c*) That the Early Church held the doctrine of Angelic advocacy; S. Hilary (*e.g.*) having taught², that "angels day by day offer up to God the prayers of those who are saved by Christ." To each of these arguments the answer is not far to seek. With regard to (*a*), the majority of the Fathers believed that the Angel who "blessed" and "redeemed" Jacob³ (Gen. xxxii. 29, xlviii. 16) and

¹ *Cat. C. Trent* (Gen. xxxii. 24). ² *In S. Matth.* xviii.

³ Cf. S. Athanas. c. Arianos, *Orat.* iv. "Jacob does not couple one of the created Angels with God who created them

was worshipped by Joshua, was the Uncreated WORD, and the context supports their view. (b) The citation from *Tobit* is of no authority in matters of faith (cf. ch. i. § 3). That from the *Revelation* proves at the most that Angels are in some way concerned in the presentation of our prayers to God: not a word is said of any prayers offered by them on our behalf; still less of any prayers to be offered to them by us. (c) The Early Church, however it may have believed in the *comprecation* of Angels as well as of departed Saints with Saints on earth, has left the strongest testimony against Angel worship. It appears that this crime was committed by perhaps more than one heretical sect of antiquity. S. Augustine surnames its perpetrators "the Angelicals." The Council of Laodicea¹ forbids Christians to "forsake the Church of God and go away and call on the names of Angels;" nay, it even anathematizes as idolators those who privately adopted such a practice. S. Chrysostom is equally unsparing. "The Devil" (he says) "it was who introduced the worship of angels.... Though it be an angel, though an archangel; though they be cherubim, endure it not. For these Powers themselves will not receive but reject it when they see the Lord dishonoured. 'I have honoured thee,' He

...but shows that it was not a created Angel, but the Word of God, whom he associated with the FATHER in his prayer." See other references in Wordsworth's *O. T. Commentary*, I. p. 137.

¹ Conc. Laodic. *Can. xxxv.* *Theodoret* explains that this Canon was directed against the descendants of the false teachers condemned by S. Paul (*Coloss. ii. 18*). "This disorder continued in Phrygia and Pisidia for a long while." It seems to have originated in a fusion of Jewish philosophy and Phrygian superstition. See Alford, *Proleg. in Coloss.*, and for a sketch of the views apparently held by these heretics, cf. Wordsworth, *Introd. to Coloss.* p. 310.

saith, 'and said to thee, Call upon Me;' and dost thou dishonour Him¹?" Nothing can be plainer than that in S. Chrysostom's judgment, to call upon Angels is to dishonour GOD.

The worship of Angels however is opposed to a greater testimony than that of St. Chrysostom, as it is a heresy older than patristic times. S. Paul has occasion to condemn certain Judaizing teachers on this very ground (Col. ii. 18), and to warn the faithful against a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, *i.e.* against "pretending humility in so doing, as if God was too great to be addressed by man; and setting aside the Mediatorship of JESUS Christ, Who is the Head both of Angels and of men²." Lastly, S. John records the reproof which he himself received from an Angel to whom he offered the worship of prostration: "See thou do it not...worship GOD" (Apoc. xxii. 9).

As to the orthodox doctrine of an Angelic Ministry, the English Church holds it to the full. On the Festival of S. Michael and All Angels, she teaches her members to bless GOD for having "ordained and constituted the services of Angels....in a wonderful order," and prays HIM to "grant that by His appointment they may succour and defend us on earth." This is in strict accordance with the teaching of Holy Scripture (Dan. xii. 1, Zech. i. 10, 12, S. Matt. xviii. 10,

¹ Quoted by Usher, *Ansv.* p. 422. S. Chrysostom (in Coloss. ii. 18) explains "the voluntary humility" of "certain which say that we must not approach God through the mediation of Christ, but through that of angels, the former being too great a thing for us to seek." How often do we hear from the lips of Romanists the same reason for preferring the intercession of Saints and Angels to our Lord's!

² From an annotated Roman Catholic Bible, published by authority.

Heb. i. 14, &c. &c.). It stands in happy contrast to the invocation uttered by the Roman Church, with all the circumstances of Divine worship, "S. Michael, S. Gabriel, S. Raphael, all Holy Angels and Archangels, pray for us¹."

§ ii. *The Veneration of Relics.*

1. **History of the practice.** From the *cultus* of departed spirits the Church of Rome descends by another step to the religious veneration of their bones and other personal remains. It will be interesting to trace the origin of this singular form of creature-worship.

In the earliest Christian times the faithful were led by sentiments of love and reverence to preserve the remains of martyrs. Those bodies which had been the Temple of the Holy Ghost, to which it had been given to suffer for the sake of Christ, which were hereafter to sit with Christ upon His throne, seemed worthy of the most respectful care. Thus the bones of S. Ignatius, left by the wild beasts on the arena of the Roman amphitheatre, were gathered by the survivors and carried to Antioch, where they were committed as an inestimable treasure to the Church of which he had been Bishop². After the martyrdom of S. Polycarp, the Jews sought (but in vain) to prevent the Christians from securing the body; sarcastically suggesting that they might be tempted to "forsake the Crucified and worship Polycarp," "not considering (as the Church of Smyrna retorts) that we can never forsake Christ, Who suffered for the salvation of all... nor worship any other; for Him indeed being the Son of GOD we adore, but the Martyrs we love as the

¹ *Rituale Roman.*

² *Martyr. S. Ignat. vi.*

disciples and followers of Our Lord, as is due to their extraordinary affection toward their King and Master¹."

However, notwithstanding this burst of honest indignation, the danger foreseen by the Jews was not altogether visionary; "this thing became a sin" to many members of the Church. In the fourth century the innocent veneration of the sub-Apostolic age had degenerated into a superstitious use of the venerated relics. The ashes of martyrs were considered needful for the dedication of churches. Altars were erected over their tombs. Private Christians purchased their bones for purposes of devotion; one instance is on record of a lady who was reproved by the Archdeacon of Carthage for kissing such a relic whenever she was about to receive the Holy Eucharist. The demand for these wares became so great as to form a distinct trade. The graves of the martyrs were pillaged to supply the market, and when the stock was exhausted counterfeits were freely offered for sale. S. Augustine testifies in the strongest language to the greatness of the evil in his day. "The crafty Enemy (he complains) has scattered everywhere so large a number of hypocrites under the garb of monks, who go from province to province...hawking, some of them, the bones of martyrs, if martyrs they were²." It became needful at length to prohibit the odious merchandise by law.

If such was the state of things in the fourth and fifth centuries, it is no matter for surprise that the dark ages which preceded the Reformation witnessed still greater excesses. The Crusaders had imported into Europe from the Holy Land a fresh supply of sacred

¹ *Eccl. Smyrn. Ep. de S. Polycarpi Martyr.*, c. xvii.

² *De Opere Monarch.* c. 28.

relics, or objects which passed as relics¹. A passion for acquiring this kind of treasure was again awakened in the minds of the superstitious. The Homily *against Peril of Idolatry* draws a memorable picture of the relic worship which preceded the days of the Reformation in England. "Because Relics were so gainful, few places were there but that they had relics provided for them. And for more plenty of relics some one saint had many heads, one in one place and another in another place. Some had six arms and twenty-six fingers. And where Our Lord bare His Cross alone, if all the pieces of the relics thereof were gathered together, the greatest ship in England would scarcely bear them....And not only the bones of the saints but everything appertaining to them was a holy relic. In some places they offer a sword, in some the scabbard, in some a shoe, in some a saddle that had been set upon some holy horse, in some the coals wherewith S. Lawrence was roasted, in some the tail of the ass which Our Lord JESUS Christ sat on, to be kissed and offered unto as a relic."

The Council of Trent, while it acknowledged that abuses might exist and expressed a desire for their removal, allowed the veneration of relics to continue; yet none but an utter stranger to the continent of Europe (a *rara avis* in these days of travel) can be cajoled into believing that the practice of the Roman Church in this respect has undergone any extensive reformation². Relics of the most grotesque character, many of them manifestly counterfeit, some of them connected with gross imposture, are still exhibited for

¹ Cf. Bp. Forbes, *On the Articles*, II. 375.

² The curious will find a sufficiently lively account of the *present* state of relic worship in Mr. Burgon's *Letters*, pp. 49—56.

the worship of the faithful in every continental Roman Catholic church of any pretensions. In GOD'S House, before GOD'S Altar, worship is offered to the bones, and blood, even to the very garments of men long dead.

2. **Testimony of Scripture.** Bellarmine has undertaken to defend the worship of relics from Holy Scripture. He cites the following passages¹: Exod. xiii. 19, Deut. xxxiv. 6, 2 Kings xiii. 21, xxiii. 16—18, S. Matt. xi. 20—22, Acts v. 15, xix. 11, 12. These texts will be found to prove (*a*) that it is lawful and right to give honourable sepulture to the bodies of holy men; (*b*) that "*special*² miracles" were wrought by contact with the personal surroundings of Our Lord and of His Apostles SS. Peter and Paul during their lifetime; (*c*) that in one instance God willed to restore a corpse to life by means of the bones of a dead prophet. It is difficult to discover what support these facts lend to the Roman system of relic worship.

On the other hand, Scripture presents an instance of a relic both ancient and important being destroyed when it was turned to a superstitious use (2 Kings xviii. 4). It is to be lamented that the significant example of Hezekiah escaped the notice of the Fathers of Trent. Unlike the godly king of Judah, who "did that which was right in the sight of the LORD," they were content to utter the mildest protest against the idolatry of relics, while they left the idol in its place.

§ iii. *The Use of Images.*

1. **Romish Doctrine.** From the *cultus* of the relics of Saints, the Church of Rome passes to a yet greater

¹ He also quotes Isai. xi. 10 (Vulg.). The Hebrew original is alien to his purpose.

² Acts xix. 11. *δυνάμεις οὐ τὰς τυχεύουσας*, *i.e.* "not of an ordinary character," unusual even in an age of miracles.

degradation, the *cultus* of their images. As to the true nature and lawful extent of this veneration much difference of opinion exists among Romanists themselves¹. All unite in disclaiming the direct *latreia* of images [εἰδωλολατρεία], which would be an act of open apostasy from Christ (1 Cor. v. 11, vi. 9, 10). Yet it has been held by Thomas Aquinas that "the same reverence is to be given to the Image of Christ as to Christ Himself²," *i.e.* the worship of *latreia*. On the same principle *douleia* is thought to be due to the images of the Saints, *hyperdouleia* to those of the Blessed Virgin. Prayers are offered before images of each kind, respect being had, it is said, not to the image itself but to the person whom it represents.

It will be seen that in whatever form the theory is propounded it involves (1) the lawfulness of offering a relative religious worship to the Saints themselves; (2) the lawfulness of offering religious worship of any kind through the medium of an image. The first position has been already examined (*supra* § i. 6). The second remains for consideration.

2. Scriptures cited by Romanists. It would be easy to fill these pages with scriptural protests against image worship. The whole history of Israel, from the Exodus to the Babylon-captivity, is a comment upon the sanctity of the Second Commandment³. The Old

¹ See the quotations given by Usher, *Answer*, &c. pp. 449—451.

² *Summ. Th.* Part III. q. 25, a. 3.

³ "The second commandment is joined with the first in the Church of Rome. This is not to be esteemed a Romish novelty. It will be found so united in the Masoretic Bibles. ...What the Roman Church deals unfairly in is, that she teaches the commandments popularly only in epitome, thus

1. Thou shalt have none other gods but Me.

2. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain...By this method her children and other less in-

Testament is one continuous condemnation of idolatry. Yet from this very volume the divines of Rome have endeavoured to set up a defence of their system. It is argued (*a*) that the prohibition against making graven images (Exod. xx. 4) cannot be absolute, since by God's own command images of cherubim were placed upon the ark, and a serpent of brass set on a pole before the whole congregation of Israel (Exod. xxv. 18; Numb. xxi. 8). (*b*) That adoration was occasionally paid by the Saints to representations of God or of Christ: *e.g.* Jacob adored the top of his rod, which was a figure of the sceptre or royal power of Christ; (Gen. xlvii. 31, cf. Heb. xi. 21; and in Ps. xcix. [xcviii. Vulg.] 5), faithful Israelites are bidden to adore the footstool of God: *i.e.* His Ark, which was the type of Our Lord's Humanity.

In answer it is enough to say (*a*) that Exod. xxv. 18, and Numb. xxi. 8 certainly appear to prove that the Second Commandment forbids the making of images only when intended for use in religious worship—the very purpose however for which they are allowed by the Church of Rome: (*b*) that of the two instances produced, the first rests upon a misunderstanding of the LXX. translation¹, itself only an alternative ren-

instructed members are often ignorant of the existence in the Decalogue of a prohibition against idolatry."—Bp. Browne *On the Articles*, p. 527 n.

¹ The pointed Hebrew text of Genesis gives וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה יִשְׂרָאֵל עַל רֹאשׁ הַמֶּטֶה: The LXX. translators, reading the last word הַמֶּטֶה, rendered προσεκύννησεν Ἰσραὴλ ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ; and the Vulgate followed with *adoravit fastigium virgæ ejus*, which supplies the Romanists with their argument. But granting that the LXX. were right (and the citation of their rendering in Heb. xi. 21 lends some colour to this view), it still remains to be shewn that προσκυνεῖν ἐπὶ is fairly rendered by the simple verb

dering of the original Hebrew; whilst in the second passage the authorized English Version gives the more probable meaning of the original. Moreover the assertion that the footstool of God signifies the Ark, wants proof. Our Lord interprets the expression of the Earth (S. Matth. v. 35), which is doubtless not a fit object for adoration. One almost wonders that the advocates of the Roman theory thought fit to betray the weakness of their cause by the production of these two most ambiguous testimonies.

3. History of Religious Art in the Early Church.

The Apostolic age was too troublous or too crowded with weightier concerns to admit of the rise of any thing like Christian Art. The warmest imagination cannot picture to itself an Apostle officiating in the midst of Crucifixes and Images. As the Christian body grew in wealth and numbers, it was natural that sculpture and painting, as well as architecture and music, should be pressed into the service of the Church. Nevertheless the change was gradual. For centuries the Church watched jealously over the progress of Art within the domain of sacred things. Her testimony against the present practice of Rome is twofold. We have (1) the *negative* evidence of existing works of art. Happily these silent witnesses have been preserved in large numbers and great variety. The

“adore”. Elsewhere the phrase is undoubtedly used by the LXX. in the sense of ‘worshipping *upon* (i. e. supported by) a prop:’ cf. 3 Kings i. 47 LXX. [= 1 Kings E. V.]; for the grammatical construction see Wahl, *s. v.* προσκυνεῖν. And this is certainly the natural interpretation in the passage before us. The aged patriarch, supporting himself on his staff while he adores God for His promises to the seed of Abraham, presents an apt picture of faith long tried but triumphant in the end: πίστει.....προσεκύνησεν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ.

Catacombs by which the ground adjacent to Rome is pierced were known as places of Christian burial to S. Jerome, and ceased to be used for that purpose from the fifth century. These undoubted monuments of primitive Christianity have yielded an abundance of rude sculptures and fresco paintings; and there are also preserved a number of glass vessels of Christian origin, on which figures are executed in gilding. The subjects are partly symbolical, partly historical; the latter consisting of scenes drawn from both the Old and New Testaments. But no images of Saints are found in this great collection: not a single Crucifix, or representation of the Crucifixion; the figure of the Blessed Virgin is all but unknown, and “never once appears in the oldest monuments¹.” (2) Still more adverse to the Roman practice are the *positive* statements of early writers. Once indeed in the first three centuries mention is made of a symbolical figure painted on an article which was used in the service of the Church. Tertullian speaks of a chalice which bore the figure of the Good Shepherd. But that images were not as yet set up in Churches is evident from the strong antipathy which was expressed at the first attempts to represent the Person of Our Lord or the Saints. Eusebius² speaks of such methods of doing honour to Christ and His Apostles as consistent with the custom of the heathen, who were wont to honour their deliverers in like manner. The Spanish Council of Eliberis, at the beginning of the 4th century, decided that even “pictures ought not to be placed in churches, lest that be painted on the walls which is worshipped

¹ Burgon, *Letters*, &c., p. 256. Maitland, *Church in the Catacombs*, p. 273.

² *H. E.* VII. 18. It must be borne in mind that the catacombs were places of sepulture not of worship (Burgon, *Letters*, &c., p. 250).

or adored." There is a letter of S. Epiphanius extant, which shews the jealous, some may think extreme watchfulness, with which the Fathers even of this period guarded against the first approaches of idolatry. Writing of a certain village in Palestine (*Anablatha* by name), he says: "I found there on the Church-doors a curtain dyed and painted, bearing the figure of Christ or of some Saint—for I do not distinctly remember whose figure it was. However, when I saw the figure of a man there hung up in the Church of Christ, contrary to the authority of Scripture, I tore it, and advised the wardens to shroud and bury in it the body of some dead pauper¹." The letter ends with an earnest request to the Bishop of Jerusalem to prohibit the use of decorations "so contrary to our religion" in the Churches of his diocese.

In the face, however, both of conciliar and episcopal protests, pictures found their way into Churches in the course of this century, but still only as *media* of popular instruction. Thus *Paulinus*, Bishop of Nola, caused the doors of a church to be painted with scenes from Scripture history; the interior however being decorated only with symbolical mosaic. *S. Gregory* of Nyssa mentions that the basilicas of martyrs were commonly painted with representations of the martyrdom. Images were still excluded. *S. Gregory* praises a certain bishop for his zeal in destroying some images which had been introduced into a church. The historical paintings which embellished church-walls had already been abused to purposes of devotion, but under protest. "I know many persons (writes *S. Augustine*) who adore pictures...These the Church condemns and daily seeks to correct as mis-conducted children²." Whatever might have been the

¹ Bingham, p. 320.

² *De Mor. Eccl.* i. 84, 74.

superstitious views of individuals, the Catholic Church of the first four centuries was wholly free from the abuse of Christian Art.

4. **Iconoclastic Controversy**¹. During the next three hundred years (A.D. 400—700) the veneration of images and pictures grew rapidly. Still the Church had not sanctioned the evil; and individual protests were occasionally entered against it. Thus in the sixth century we learn, from the correspondence of Gregory the Great, that a Bishop of Marseilles destroyed certain images which had received the adoration of the populace. The Pope commended his abhorrence of idolatry, but maintained that the images should have been retained as vehicles of instruction: "pictures and statues are the books of the uneducated." At length the question was brought to an issue by the rough common sense of a man who had risen from obscurity to the Imperial purple. In 724 Leo the Isaurian put forth an edict against the worship of images; and this was followed up by a second, requiring the destruction of all pictures and statues in Churches. These acts of open "war against images" [*εἰκονομαχία*] provoked violent opposition both in the East and West. The Pope addressed to the Emperor a letter of open defiance, and in Italy the edicts were set at nought. Leo's son and successor, Constantinus Copronymus, sought to strengthen his position by a General Council. More than three hundred bishops were gathered to Constantinople (A.D. 754), and canons were made which prohibited both the worship and the use of images. But the triumph of the iconoclast party was short. In 787 another Council assembled at Nicæa, under the auspices of the Emperor Irene,

¹ For fuller particulars, see Neander, Vol. v.; Robertson, Vol. II.; Mosheim, Vol. II.

and reversed the decrees passed at Constantinople. This Council (which by the Roman Church has been dignified with the title of the Seventh Œcumenical) ordered that figures of Our Lord, of the Virgo Deipara, and of the Saints, executed in painting or mosaic, or of any other suitable material, be retained in churches, and receive from the faithful, not indeed the *latreia* due to GOD alone, but the worship of kissing and genuflexion¹, of lights and incense. "For (the document proceeds) the honour which is paid to the image passes to its prototype, and he who worships the image worships therein the person whom it represents."

It is unnecessary to pursue any further the windings of the controversy. The Nicene decree practically determined the teaching of the Western Church. Charlemagne and his Frank Bishops indeed indignantly rejected the decision, and the *Libri Carolini* and decrees of the Council of Frankfort (794) remain as a last but vigorous protest against the inroads of idolatry. It is satisfactory to know that British Bishops occupied seats in the protesting synod. But the victory of the "image worshippers" [εἰκονόδουλοι], if not complete, was secured. The Council of Nicæa is the mainstay in this matter of the Council of Trent. The Church of Rome is indebted to the Church of the eighth century for her present practice, and even for the arguments by which it is defended.

5. Use of the Cross. In Tertullian's time the sign of the Cross was already in common use among Christians. "We wear our foreheads with it²," is his

¹ ἀσπασμὸν καὶ τιμητικὴν προσκύνησιν, οὐ μὴν τὴν κατὰ πίστιν ἡμῶν ἀληθινὴν λατρείαν. Conc. Nic. II. Sess. vii. Labbe, VII. p. 556.

² *De Coron. Milit.* 3.

emphatic expression. It was made on all occasions, at meals, at the bath, &c. In prayer it was not unusual to extend the arms after a cruciform manner¹. The sign of the Cross was used with especial solemnity in the Services of the Church, at the admission of Catechumens, at Baptism, at Ordination, at the Holy Table. Its retention in the Anglican Baptismal Offices² is thus in perfect accordance with the spirit of primitive Christianity. Several centuries passed, however, before the figure of the Cross was employed by Christian Art. It is questionable whether it occurs on any Christian monument of the first four centuries³. There is however documentary evidence of its use, both by private persons and in churches, in the fourth century⁴; and in the fifth it seems to have become customary to place a gold or silver Cross upon the altar⁵. The Crucifix, on the other hand, appears to have been unknown even at this period.

But however extensively the sign or figure of the Cross may have been used, there is distinct evidence that its use was memorial, not devotional. To the heathens, who had sarcastically charged the Christians with Cross worship, the Apologist Minucius Felix dryly retorts: "We neither worship crosses nor wish for them⁶." When Helena, the mother of Constantine, believed herself to have found the wood of the true Cross, "she adored (we are told by S. Ambrose⁷) the King,—not the wood, but Him who hung upon it: to adore the wood is an error of the heathen, a vain conceit of ungodly men."

¹ Bingham, p. 651.

² See Canon xxx.

³ Burgon, p. 240.

⁴ Forbes, II. p. 365.

⁵ Bingham, p. 304.

⁶ Minucius Felix, *Octav. c.* xxix.

⁷ *De Obitu Theodos.*

Can it be said that the Church of Rome is equally free from this error when she teaches her members to kneel and pray before the Cross or Crucifix, to kiss it with a kiss of religious veneration, and even to address it in hymns of praise and prayer¹?

6. **Common Romanist plea for Image worship.** "The honour paid to Images is referred to their prototypes" (Catech. Co. Trent. III. c. ii. Q. xxiv.). No divinity or virtue is supposed to reside in the Image itself: no petition offered to it. It is simply a help to devotion, a *medium* through which the mind of the worshipper passes to the Object of worship which it represents. Such is the usual answer of the Romanist when charged with idolatry.

Unhappily, this is by no means a sufficient statement of the case. If no virtue is thought to reside in the image itself, why is one particular image preferred above another for purposes of devotion? Why is one supposed to have peculiar powers of working miracles or communicating grace which are denied to another? If Roman images are simply aids to the memory, helps to devotion, why should they be kissed, after the manner of the ancient Baal-worship²? Why should they receive the prostrations of the faithful? Why should such infinite peril of direct idolatry be incurred, when the mere purpose of "assisting devotion" might be equally gained by the less dangerous process of ocular display?

The plea, however, has one undoubted merit. It is of high, even of primitive antiquity. It is the identical excuse with which the heathen responded to the at-

¹ *Rituale Rom.* p. 278. Comp. the following from the Breviary, *Hebd.* IV.: "O crux ave, spes unica...auge piis justitiam, reisque dona veniam."

² 1 Kings xix. 18.

tacks of early Christian apologists. "We worship the Gods by means of their images" was their reply. The Christian rejoinder has also been preserved, and it reads almost like the answer of an Anglican to a modern Romanist. "You say (writes Arnobius¹) that you worship the gods in your images....What greater wrong or reproach (to your gods) can be imagined, than to know a certain deity, and yet to supplicate some other thing—to expect help from a Divine Power, and yet offer your prayers to a senseless image?" "There are persons (continues S. Augustine²) who account themselves to be of a purer faith, and say, 'I do not worship the image...but I regard the material statue as a sign of the object to which I owe veneration.'.....But who is there that worships or offers prayer with his eyes fixed on an image without being beguiled into the fancy that the image itself is listening to his prayer and grants him his desire³?"

¹ *Adv. Gentes*, VI. 9.

² *In Psalm. cxiii.*

³ Modern heathenism shelters itself under the same useful plea. The following remarkable parallel to the Roman system of saint and image worship was communicated to the writer a few weeks ago by the Rev. H. Townsend, an English Church Missionary, who has laboured for more than thirty years among the heathen people of West Africa. The natives of Abeokuta believe in one Supreme Deity, but think that He is to be approached only through the mediation of their departed heroes. These mediator-spirits are represented by images, before which prayers are offered, and which are practically worshipped by the common people. Yet the more intelligent disclaim the character of idolaters, professing to regard the images as mere symbols of the powers which they represent. *Mutato nomine de te Fabula narratur*, [Roma].

CHAPTER VII.

OF THE LANGUAGE OF COMMON PRAYER.

CHURCH OF ROME.

"Although the Mass contains great instruction for the faithful people, nevertheless it has not seemed expedient to the Fathers [sc. of the Tridentine Council] that it should be everywhere celebrated in the vulgar tongue."—Co. of Trent, Sess. XXII. Ch. viii.

"If any one saith...that the Mass ought to be celebrated in the vulgar tongue only...let him be anathema."—Ibid. Canon ix.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

"It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the Primitive Church to have public Prayer in the Church, or to minister the Sacraments in a tongue not understood of the people."—Art. XXIV.

1. **Teaching of the Word of God.** Only one passage bears at all directly upon this question, but its testimony is happily sufficient. In 1 Cor. xiv. S. Paul speaks of certain abuses which had accompanied the "gift of tongues." The gift seems to have been designed to subserve two purposes, (a) the conviction of unbelievers (v. 22), (b) the exercise of *private* devotion. At Corinth, it appears, an attempt had been made to press this miraculous power into the *public* services of the Church. The result was an unedifying display, which S. Paul warmly reproveth. "Let him

that speaketh in an unknown tongue pray that he may interpret...Else if thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say [the] Amen at thy giving of thanks¹, seeing he knoweth not what thou sayest? For thou verily givest thanks well, but the other is not edified...In the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue...Let all things be done unto edifying."

The principle involved in this passage is perfectly clear. One great end of public worship is general edification. The use of a language unknown to the majority of the worshippers, being inconsistent with this end, is not permissible. It was condemned even when the power to speak in foreign tongues proceeded from the Spirit of God. It is to be condemned *à fortiori* now that spiritual gifts have ceased.

2. **Custom of the primitive Church.** That the practice of primitive antiquity is alien from their own has been confessed by learned Romanists². At a comparatively early period there existed liturgies (*i.e.* Eucharistic offices) not only in the Greek and Latin tongue, but also in Ethiopian, Coptic, Syriac, &c. The liturgy of the ancient Roman Church was probably Greek; but at a time when that Church was chiefly composed of

¹ This 'giving of thanks' [*εὐχαριστία*] is probably the Prayer of Consecration at Holy Communion (see Palmer, *Orig. Liturg.* II. 114; Wordsworth, *Greek Test. in loc.*). The layman [*ιδιώτης*] has his part to perform in the celebration: it is his to assent to the Priest's act by saying the Amen. (*πᾶς ὁ παρὼν λαὸς ἐπανευφημεῖ λέγων τὸ Ἄμην* (Justin M. *Apol.* II.). From this office the laity are shut out in the Church of Rome, as of old in the Corinthian Church.

² See *e.g.* a passage quoted by Bp. Forbes, *Articles*, II. p. 431.

a Greek-speaking people¹. In the East, again, a Greek liturgy would have been almost everywhere “understood of the people.” S. Paul wrote in Greek to the Galatians with as much certainty of being intelligible to his readers as if he had addressed them in their native Celtic². As long as one language passed current over so large a portion of the Christian world there could have been but little opportunity for adopting the vernacular; just as at the present time no reasonable objection would lie against a Latin service-book, if Latin were commonly spoken or understood.

However, that the vernacular was used by the Early Church whenever there was occasion for it, we have the clearest testimonies³. Thus *Origen* says, “At prayer the Greeks use the Greek language, the Romans the Latin, and so every one in his own dialect prays to God and gives thanks as he can, and the God of all languages hears them pray in all dialects⁴.” *S. Jerome* incidentally mentions that at the funeral of Paula the Psalms were sung in Greek, Latin and Syriac, because there were men of each of those languages present⁵. *Cassiodorus* explains Ps. xlv. 14 (“raiment of needlework” or “divers colours,”) of “the variety of languages wherewith every nation sang to God in the Church after his own native tongue.” Again, in early writers we meet with frequent mention of the responses of the congregation. *Justin Martyr*, in the earliest extant account of worship after the Apostolic age, speaks of the ‘Amen’ with which the people expressed

¹ Cf. Prof. Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 40.

² Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 12 (note).

³ See a large collection of these in Usher, *De Script. et Sacr. Vernaculis*, c. 2.

⁴ *Contr. Celsum*, VIII.

⁵ *Ad Eustoch.* (Epitaph Paulæ.)

their assent to the Eucharistic prayer (see above, p. 122, n.). S. Cyril of Jerusalem describes how in his day the people responded to the priest at Holy Communion in the very words which are still used by the English Church ; 'Lift up your hearts'—'*we lift them up to the Lord.*' 'Let us give thanks unto the Lord'—'*it is meet and right so to do.*' S. Chrysostom speaks of children's voices mingling with the voices of adults, and says, "Though all respond, yet the voice proceeds as if from one mouth¹." "You may see the people taking a large part in the prayers;" and then, after mentioning other instances, he adds, "even at the awful mysteries (*i.e.* the Holy Eucharist), as the priest prays for the people, so the people pray for the priest²." At Rome, in S. Jerome's time, the people shouted their Amens with the voice of thunder. It is scarcely necessary to point out the close agreement³ of our English services, when conducted in the spirit of the Prayer-book, with these pictures of primitive worship ; or the contrast presented by the Roman Mass with its dumb show and hopeless exclusion of any properly congregational element.

3. History of the Roman Catholic practice.

It must not be supposed that the Church of Rome was ever guilty of the enormous folly of deliberately substituting in her service-books an unknown tongue for the vernacular. Her error consists in having perpetuated an obvious abuse, and even fenced it round with an anathema (see extracts, p. 121). We freely grant that over its earlier stages she had little or no control. It was natural that the Latin tongue should be em-

¹ *Mystagog.* v.

² *Hom. in* 1 Cor. xiv. (xxxvii.)

³ *Hom. in* 2 Cor. viii. (xviii). The whole passage deserves attention.

ployed in the worship of Western Christendom, while Rome continued to be the centre of European society. It was natural also that the Church should be slow to adapt her service-books to the variations through which Latin passed during its conversion into the languages of modern Europe. A time must indeed have come when in Spain, in France, in Italy itself the old Latin ceased to be intelligible to the vulgar¹. But the epoch was not distinguished by any very definite indications: no distinct barriers marked off the new from the old, no general demand was raised for a translation of the ancient offices; clergy and people doubtless clung to the time-honoured words, scarcely noticing the gradual process by which the once living outpourings of devotion were fossilized into cold and lifeless forms.

Yet it is to be feared that the selfish policy of the Latin Church in the Middle Ages was in part responsible for the continuance of the evil. The ecclesiastical use of the Latin tongue tended to maintain the influence of the Roman See over the Churches of Europe. Moreover, in the eyes of an illiterate and superstitious people it served to throw an air of mystery over the rites of religion, and to increase the veneration in which the priesthood were held. These considerations doubtless had their weight with the Mediæval Church. Nevertheless, some honourable efforts were made in the direction of reform. In the eighth century the Council of Leptines enjoined that parts of the Baptismal Office should be translated into German². In the ninth century Pope John VIII. recommended to the newly-converted 'Slaves the use

¹ The beginning of the seventh century may be considered, roughly speaking, as the date of the transition.

² Forbes, *Articles*, II. p. 433.

of a liturgy in the Slavonic tongue. Even so late as A.D. 1215 the fourth Lateran Council directed the Bishops to provide churches where the people spoke different tongues with priests who could "celebrate the Divine Offices according to their several uses and languages¹."

The Council of Trent however rendered any general reformation hopeless; for although its decree spoke only of a Latin *Mass*, and of that permissively, the establishment of the Latin tongue in all the important Offices of the Roman Church followed almost of necessity.

4. **Progress of Reform in England.** Among the earliest measures of the English Reformation was the opening to the vulgar of the treasures of devotion which had been locked up in the Latin Service-books. The English Bible was set up in churches A.D. 1540, an English Litany for church use appeared in 1544, and finally in 1549 the Reformers issued a complete English Prayer-book, the same in substance with the existing Book of Common Prayer. The preface to the first edition runs: "The service in this Church of England these many years hath been read in Latin to the people, which they understood not, so that they have heard with their ears only, and their heart and spirit and mind have not been edified thereby....Here you have an Order for Prayer...a great deal more pro-

¹ Labbe, XI. Can. IX. "A curious relic of better times remains to this day in the Roman Pontifical, the Bishop in conferring the order of Readers being directed to say, 'Study to utter the words of God, that is the sacred lessons, distinctly and clearly, that the faithful may understand and be edified thereby.'" Bingham justly remarks that this form of words is evidently "much ancients than the corruption that is now crept into their services, and only stands there as a monument of their reproach" (I. 602).

fitable...in such a language and order as is most easy and plain for the understanding both of the readers and hearers." That the change was made advisedly and in no spirit of factious opposition is plain from a paragraph in the same preface, which allows that "when men say Morning and Evening Prayer privately, they may say the same in any language that they themselves do understand;" and from a clause in the Act of Uniformity (14 Car. II. c. 18), which secures to the Universities, Colleges, and Houses of Convocation the right of using the Latin Prayer-book. On the same principle our foreign missionaries have always enjoyed the fullest liberty of translating the Offices of the Church into the languages of the people among whom they labour; so that, excepting the Bible itself, there is probably no book which is extant in so many languages as the Book of Common Prayer. Thus, from the era of the Reformation, the English Church has been true to her simple and intelligible principle—the principle laid down by S. Paul, and carried out by the whole primitive Church—that *Common Prayer* is to be offered in a language commonly understood.

5. **Roman Catholic apologies.** The contrary position maintained by the Roman Church seems at first sight utterly indefensible. Nor is any serious defence set up from Scripture or the Fathers. Yet that no practice of an infallible Church may be abandoned as desperate, reasons of expediency have been found for the maintenance of this manifest abuse. (1) It is pleaded that the Church throughout the world testifies her unity by everywhere offering prayer and praise in one and the same language. Our answer is given in the words of Pope John VIII. (A.D. 880): "We are admonished by the authority of inspiration

to praise the Lord not in three tongues only [sc. Hebrew, Greek, and Latin] but in all: for Holy Scripture directs ‘Praise the Lord, all ye nations; praise Him, all ye people;’ and S. Paul strikes the same note, ‘Let every tongue confess to God¹.’” The forced uniformity of an unknown tongue is fictitious and valueless: the real unity of the Church consists in the union of all “peoples and tongues” in one act of worship (Rev. vii. 9, 10). (2) It is said to be essential to the preservation of the right Faith that the formularies of the Church should be embalmed in a dead language, which is beyond the reach of change. An argument perfectly sound when urged in support of Latin Creeds and Articles of Religion; but inapplicable to Common Prayer. The object of Symbols is to preserve the faith: of Offices, to propagate it. The former require the protection of a dead language: the latter, the life and elasticity of a living tongue. (3) The practical difficulty is urged of continually adapting Church Services to the fluctuations of the vernacular. But the English Prayer-book supplies a sufficient answer. During more than 300 years it has undergone scarcely any verbal alterations, and needed none. Notwithstanding the occurrence of a few archaic forms, there is scarcely a book in the English language which is so intelligible to the unlettered classes. Even should revision become necessary, the inconvenience of such an occasional change would count as nothing in comparison with the manifold blessings which the possession of a sound manual of devotion has bestowed upon the people of England. (4) It is pleaded that by means of translations and expositions, for which the Tridentine decree expressly provides, the faithful are

¹ Labbe, *Concil.* Vol. IX. *Ep. Joann. P.* ccxlviii.

enabled mentally to follow the prayers of the Priest. To which we can only answer, that we trust in God it may be so; yet such a machinery must in its very nature be at once cumbrous and incomplete; the congregational responses of the Early Church¹, perpetuated in all well-conducted Anglican Services, are impossible in the churches of the modern Latin communion.

To conclude in the eloquent language of Bishop Jeremy Taylor²—"If the words of the Apostle and the practice of the primitive Church, the sayings of the Fathers, and the confessions of wise men amongst themselves;...if the needs of the ignorant, and the very inseparable conditions of holy prayers; if the laws of princes and the laws of the Church which do require all our prayers to be said by them that understand what they say; if all these cannot prevail with the Church of Rome to do so much good to the people's souls as to consent they should understand what in particular they are to ask of God, certainly there is a great pertinacity of opinion, and but a little charity to those precious souls for whom Christ died and for whom they must give account."

¹ The congregational character of public worship has so long been lost in the Roman Church as to be now not even desired. Cf. the following extract from a popular R. C. treatise (*Protestant Principles examined by the written word*, p. 153): "Private prayer is the people's prayer for themselves: *public prayer is the priest's prayer for the people*...It is not the people's office but the Priest's for the people." Strange words these would have seemed to S. Chrysostom—stranger still to S. Paul!

² *Dissuasive*, pt. I. § 8.

CHAPTER VIII.

OF THE NUMBER OF THE SACRAMENTS.

CHURCH OF ROME.

"If any one saith that the Sacraments of the New Law were not all instituted by JESUS Christ Our Lord; or that they are more or less than seven, to wit, Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Order and Matrimony; or even that any one of these seven is not truly and properly a Sacrament: let him be anathema."
—Co. of Trent, Sess. VII. Can. i.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

"There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord."

"Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures; but yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God."—Article XXV.

"How many Sacraments hath Christ ordained in His Church? Answer. Two only, as generally necessary to salvation, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord."—Ch. Catechismi.

1. **Points of Dispute.** These are evidently two. (1) There are five out of the seven Tridentine Sacraments which the Church of England refuses to place in the same category with Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. (2) Two out of the five, Penance and Extreme Unction, she rejects altogether, at least in their Roman form. The present chapter will be occupied with the consideration of the first point: for (2) see chh. x. and xii.

2. **Definition of the term "Sacrament."** Are the Churches agreed as to the nature of a Sacrament? The question is important; for if not, the difference may be merely verbal.

The Latin *Sacramentum* signifies properly "anything sacred;" hence an oath, and especially the military oath of obedience and allegiance. In this latter sense it passed into the use of the Christian Church. *Tertullian* adopts it to express the Baptismal promise of allegiance to Christ¹. By an easy transition the word was applied to the ceremony of Baptism, and then (not without a glance perhaps at its primary signification) to any sacred rite. Lastly it came to be used as the counterpart of the Greek *μυστήριον*, and to denote any mystery of the Faith—whether ceremony or type or doctrine. Thus *S. Cyprian* speaks of the many Sacraments (*i. e.* doctrines) of the Lord's prayer. *S. Augustine*² (or an early preacher under his name) says that the Creed is "of few words, but great in Sacraments," *i. e.* mysterious facts; among which he presently enumerates "the *Sacrament* of our Lord's taking human nature and the *mystery* of His death and resurrection." Again the manna and the Red Sea

¹ Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, p. 352.

² *Serm.* CCXLII. Vol. v. 2975.

were in patristic language Sacraments, *i. e.* typical events. The component parts of one and the same ceremony were sometimes separately called "Sacraments:" thus Pope Innocent I. mentions the "*Sacraments of Christ's Body and Blood*¹."

The term then is evidently ambiguous. It is not of Scriptural origin²; and the Early Church, from which it has descended to us, employed it with much latitude of meaning. Hence if the Church of Rome had chosen to call every sacred rite a Sacrament, no objection could have been reasonably taken to such a course. Our own Homilies do not scruple to speak of the "Sacrament of Matrimony³." "In a general acceptance (they freely admit⁴) the name of Sacrament may be attributed to anything whereby an holy thing is signified." But the Council of Trent has been careful to renounce this laxer meaning. Each of its seven Sacraments is *truly and properly* a Sacrament⁵, *i. e.*, such in the same sense as Baptism and the Eucharist; not merely a sacred rite, or even a significant rite, but a rite "instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord," "necessary to salvation," and "containing the grace which it signifies." In this stricter sense the English

¹ *Ep. ad Decent. c. 5.*

² In Eph. v. 32, the Vulg. gives "*sacramentum hoc magnum est*" for τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστί, where *sacramentum* like μυστήριον stands for "a doctrine of revelation." The passage has, of course, been turned to account by unlearned Romanists, but its true meaning is acknowledged by their greatest divines, *e.g.* Cajetan, Estius. (Cf. Alford *in loc.*)

³ *Serm. on Swearing, pt. I.*

⁴ *Homily of Common Prayer and Sacraments.*

⁵ The Tridentine Catechism allows that the Sacraments differ in degrees of dignity and necessity though not in kind. Baptism, Penance, and the Eucharist are the most necessary: the Eucharist is the most excellent.

Church acknowledges but two "Sacraments of the Gospel."

3. **Reasons for the Anglican view.** Independently of her manifest right in a matter of this kind to reject the arbitrary decision of another Church, the Church of England has very sufficient grounds for placing Baptism and the Eucharist under a distinct category. (1) Holy Scripture, though it does not formally separate these two from other ordinances of the Gospel, gives to them a prominence certainly not less marked than that which they receive in the teaching of the Anglican Church. (2) From the nature of the case the position which they occupy in the Christian system is exceptional. The one is the initiatory, the other the sustaining rite of Christianity. "Without the one...no person can become a Christian: without the other...no adult Christian can be in close communion with God¹." They are therefore necessary for all persons, in every condition of life². Nothing of this kind can be said of the other five. (3) It is reasonable that the only two ceremonial ordinances instituted by Our Lord *in person* should be hedged off from the rest by a separate name. The personal institutions of the Head of the Church possess a peculiar sanctity and claim upon the obedience of mankind, which are thus recognised and set forth³.

¹ Blunt (J. H.), *Sacraments, &c.* p. 27.

² "Generally necessary" (Ch. Cat.) = *in genere, i. e.* "for the race of man as a whole." See Mr Maclear's *Class-book of the Catechism*, p. 140.

³ *Confirmation*, which comes nearest of the five to the Anglican definition, wants our Lord's personal institution. In the Church of Rome it lacks also the outward sign ordained in Holy Scripture, *i. e.* the imposition of hands. So "corrupt" is Roman "following of the Apostles." In the early Church, Confirmation was regarded as one of the Sacraments (*i. e.* mystic ceremonies) of Baptism. See Bingham, I. 545.

(4) This distinction was maintained by the Early Church even before the word *Sacramentum* had acquired a fixed theological sense. *Justin Martyr* in his Apology mentions but two distinctively Christian rites, describing them at some length, as essential features of Christianity¹. *S. Chrysostom* regards the Blood and Water which flowed from the Lord's pierced Side as typical of the two ordinances "by which the Church consists;" "the initiated (he says) know that they are regenerated by Water, and sustained with Blood and Flesh²." *S. Augustine* though (as we have seen) he uses the term "Sacrament" in the looser sense, yet when he applies it to ceremonial ordinances, mentions expressly but these two. "Our Lord Jesus Christ (he writes to Januarius) has subjected us to an easy yoke and a light burden. Hence He has bound His new society to the observance of but a very few Sacraments, and these most easy of celebration, most excellent in signification, as Baptism in the Name of the Trinity, and the Communion of His own Body and Blood, and aught else that is prescribed in the Canonical Scriptures³." (5) If the use of the word "Sacramentum" was not by the Early Church confined to Baptism and the Eucharist, yet it certainly was not appropriated to seven ordinances, *neither less nor more*. With the Church of Rome this theory is a matter of faith: repeated anathemas are pronounced by the Council of Trent against every one who shall presume to maintain the contrary. And yet the belief did not find expression before the twelfth century.

¹ *Apol.* I. 24—99.

² *Hom. in S. Joann.* 84.

³ Vol. II. 185, cf. III. 37. *S. Augustine* defines ceremonial sacraments as "sacred signs." They are so named (v. 1614) because in them "one thing appears, and another is understood."

Peter Lombard was "the first to formulize the number in the Latin Church¹."

Against such intolerant innovation the English Church has good reason to protest. How gently her protest is uttered—how careful she is not to entangle herself in a mere strife of words, let the following extracts from the "Homily of Common Prayer and Sacraments" attest. "As for the number of them, if they should be considered according to the exact signification of a Sacrament, namely for the visible signs, expressly commanded in the New Testament, whereunto is annexed the promise of free forgiveness of our sin, and of our holiness and joining in Christ, there be but two; namely, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord. For although Absolution hath the promise of forgiveness of sin; yet by the express word of the New Testament it hath not this promise annexed and tied to the visible sign, which is imposition of hands. For this visible sign, I mean laying on of hands, is not expressly commanded in the New Testament to be used in Absolution, as the visible signs in Baptism and the Lord's Supper are: and therefore absolution is no such sacrament as Baptism and the Communion are. And though the Ordering of Ministers hath His visible sign and promise; yet it lacks the promise of remission of sin, as all other Sacraments besides do. Therefore neither it, nor any other Sacrament else be such Sacraments as Baptism and the Communion are."

¹ Bp. Forbes, II. 446. The Catechism of the Council of Trent, with a splendid contempt for facts, says that it was "handed down by the tradition of the Fathers" (Pt. II. i. 14).

CHAPTER IX.

OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

CHURCH OF ROME.

"This faith hath ever been in the Church of God, that immediately after the consecration the veritable Body of our Lord and His veritable Blood, together with His Soul and Divinity, are under the species of Bread and Wine."

"By the consecration of the Bread and Wine a conversion is made of the whole substance of the Bread into the substance of the Body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the Wine into the substance of His Blood; which conversion is by the Holy Catholic Church suitably and properly called Transubstantiation."—Co. of Trent, Sess. XIII. ch. 4.

"In this Sacrament are contained not only the true Body of Christ and whatever appertains to the true nature of a body, such as bones and nerves, but also Christ whole

CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

"Almighty God...hath given His Son, not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance in that holy Sacrament."

"If with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy Sacrament... then we spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood."—Order of Holy Communion.

"The inward part or thing signified [in the Eucharist is] the Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper."—Ch. Catechism.

"To such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ."

"Transubstantiation (or the

and entire.”—Cat. of Co. of Trent, Pt. II. c. iv. q. xxxi.

“Wherefore there is no room left for doubt that all the faithful of Christ may render in veneration the worship of latria which is due to the True God, to this most holy Sacrament.”—Co. of Trent, Sess. XIII. ch. 5.

“If any one denieth that... the whole Christ is contained under each species...let him be anathema.”—Co. of Trent, Sess. XIII. Can. iii.

“If any one saith that by precept of God or by necessity of salvation all and each of the faithful of Christ ought to receive both species of the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, let him be anathema.”

“If any one saith that the holy Catholic Church was not induced, by just causes and reasons, to communicate under the species of Bread only laymen and also clerics when not consecrating, let him be anathema.”—Sess. XXI. Can. i. ii.

“He, our God and Lord... offered up to God the Father His own Body and Blood under the species of bread and wine; and under the symbols of those same things He delivered His own Body and Blood to be received by His Apostles, whom He then constituted priests of the New Testament; and by those words ‘Do this in commemoration of

change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

“The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith.

“The Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper was not by Christ’s ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.”—Article XXVIII.

“No adoration...ought to be done either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporal Presence¹ of Christ’s natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored: (for that were idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;) and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven and not here; it being against the truth of Christ’s natural Body to be at one time in more places than one.”—Rubric at end of Order for Holy Communion. [1662.]

“The Cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the Lay-people:

¹ “Real and essential presence” (1552).

me,' He commanded them and their successors in the priesthood to offer them; even as the Catholic Church has always understood and taught."—*Sess. XXII. ch. i.*

"If any one saith that in the Mass a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God—that the sacrifice of the Mass is only a sacrifice of praise and of thanksgiving, or that it is a bare commemoration of the sacrifice consummated on the cross, but not a propitiatory sacrifice: or...that it ought not to be offered for the living and the dead for sins, pains, satisfactions and other necessities—that by the sacrifice of the Mass a blasphemy is cast upon the most holy Sacrifice of Christ consummated on the Cross, or that it is thereby derogated from—let him be anathema."—*Sess. XXII. Can. i. iii. iv.*

for both the parts of the Lord's Sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike."—*Art. XXX.*

"Then shall the Minister first receive the Communion in both kinds himself, and then proceed to deliver the same to the Bishops, Priests and Deacons in like manner (if any be present) and after that to the people also in order."—*Rubric: Order for Holy Communion.*

"The Offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits."—*Art. XXXI.*

"[Almighty God gave His] only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption; Who made there (by His one oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world; and did institute and in His holy Gospel command us to continue a perpetual memory of that His precious death, until His coming again."—*Prayer of Consecration.*

§ i. *Of Transubstantiation.*

1. **Point at issue.** In common with the Church of Rome and with the whole Catholic Church, the Church of England teaches that the Body and Blood of Christ are really given and received in this Sacrament. She differs from Rome in holding that the Eucharistic Presence is spiritual and not substantial, to be received by faith, and not by oral manducation.

2. **Definition of "Transubstantiation."** At the XIIIth Session of the Council of Trent (1551), the mode of the Sacramental Presence was the subject of a warm dispute between Dominicans and Franciscans; the former holding that the substance of the Bread is transmuted; the latter that it ceases to be. The decree of the Council is understood to have been framed with the view of satisfying both parties, and therefore to admit of either construction¹. Whether by substitution or by transmutation, the consecrated elements have lost their proper *substance*; the *accidents* alone remaining (*i.e.* their colour, taste, size, &c.). Under the species, and under every part of the species, the whole Christ is thenceforth contained—His Body and Blood, His Soul and Divinity. This miracle is labelled by the Council with the name of *Transubstantiation*, a term which had been previously adopted by the Lateran Council of 1215.

3. **Meaning of the word "Substance."** According to the scholastic philosophy, derived from Aristotelian sources, every material object may be resolved in thought into "substance" and "accidents." The substance of a body (from the Tridentine point of view) has no property which can be discerned by the senses or detected by chemical analysis. It possesses

¹ Sarpi, *Hist. Co. Trent*, lib. iv.

neither extension nor solidity. These belong to the "accidental form;" they may be changed while the substance remains invariable; *e.g.* a hard body may become soft, a small surface large, a white object red, from causes that do not in the slightest degree affect the underlying nature which makes the body what it is.

Now Transubstantiation is the reverse of the common process. In this case, the *accidents* remain unaltered: the substance alone is changed. The wafer was Bread: after consecration it is the Body of Christ. Or rather, its "substance" has been converted into the "substance" of Christ's Body: Christ exists under the accidents of the wafer whole, entire, yet in substance only, *i.e.* without solidity or extension or any sensible property whatsoever. The "accidents" of the consecrated Wafer are the accidents of bread: its "substance" (in the Tridentine sense of the term) is Christ.

An attempt has been recently made to draw a distinction between this theory and that which the Church of England condemns. It has been pleaded that the "Transubstantiation" of the XXVIIIth Article is not the scholastic "Transubstantiation" of the Tridentine divines, but the grossly materialistic belief which was held by the vulgar at the period of the Reformation, and which is still commonly thought to be represented by the term. In short, it is now said that the Church of England simply intends to condemn Transaccidentation; that Transubstantiation, in its Tridentine sense, is identical with her own view of the Eucharistic Presence¹. But this idea, however

¹ The suggestion is perhaps originally due to Mr Newman, Tract xc. p. 49 &c. (ed. Pusey). It has been worked out with some assurance by the anonymous author of the *Kiss of Peace* (Hayes, 1867), and more cautiously by Bp. Forbes,

skilfully it may have been worked out, is beset with improbabilities. The decree of the Council of Trent was passed in 1551: the 29 (= 28)th Article of the Church of England was approved by Convocation in the following year. Is it probable that our Reformers were either so careless, or so ill-informed in the topics of the day, as to use a theological term without one word of explanation in a different sense from that in which it had just received the *imprimatur* of Rome? Is it possible that men of such gigantic stature in theology as Cranmer and Ridley and Jewel could have been ignorant of the definite meaning which the word had borne among theologians for above three hundred years? Has it been reserved for the nineteenth century to discover a misconception so palpable, so fatal to sober discussion, so unjust to our opponents? It is now said that even Bishop Andrewes failed to understand the Roman view¹. Probably there are few English Churchmen who will not think it safe to err in his company.

4. **Argument from Scripture.** (a) *Words of Institution.* It is not denied that Our Lord called the Sacramental Bread His Body and the Sacramental Cup His Blood. The question is simply one of interpretation. Is the Roman view of His words the only view which is consistent with an honest treatment of the passage?

In this inquiry our best guide will be the analogy of Scriptural language and facts. Now, we have no instance of any similar form of words employed to denote a change miraculously produced. *A priori*,

Articles, II. pp. 545—552. See also Dr Pusey, *Eirenicon*, p. 24, who thinks that *Transubstantiation* has acquired a new meaning since the Council of Trent. His *one* reason will hardly have much weight with other minds.

¹ *Kiss of Peace*, pp. 67, 68.

we should expect in such a case to read "Let this become," or "This is made, My Body" [τοῦτο γενηθήτω—γέγονεν—τὸ σῶμά Μου· rather than τοῦτό ἐστιν]. But the form which actually occurs, though without an exact parallel in Scripture, is not very dissimilar from a class of expressions which not only admit but require a figurative interpretation. "The seven good kine are seven years" (Gen. xli. 26); "The ten horns are ten kings" (Dan. vii. 24); "The field is the world" (S. Matt. xiii. 38); "These [women] are the two covenants" (Gal. iv. 24); "The seven stars are the angels" (Apoc. i. 20); are familiar examples. Allowing that the analogy is not complete, because each of these sentences carries with it palpable evidence of its figurative character; still it remains true that the nearest parallels which Scripture supplies are uniformly unfavourable to the literal view of the passage under discussion.

Nor does this view gain any support from the analogy of Scripture *facts*. All the miracles of Scripture appealed to the senses of those who witnessed them. We read of miraculous changes—changes in all probability of substance; but in each case the accidents were converted also. The rod of Moses, when changed into a serpent, assumed the serpent's form (Exod. iv. 3, 4). The water made wine acquired the taste of wine (S. John ii. 10). The miracle of Transubstantiation alone refuses to submit to this test. Though wrought upon matter, it leaves no sensible trace of its operation. We do not say that such a change is impossible; we are content to point out the suspicious contrast in which it stands to all the indisputable workings of miraculous power.

(b) *Our Lord's discourse in the Synagogue of Capernaum* (S. John vi. 47—59) is the next Scriptural

stronghold of Romanist divines. "The Bread that I will give is My Flesh...Whoso eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life."... "Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man...ye have no life in you." These are strong words, and words of certain truth; but it is by no means so clear that they teach a substantial Presence in the Eucharist. For (1) there are grave reasons against supposing that the passage refers to the Eucharist *exclusively*, or to oral manducation at all. No Romanist will maintain that all who receive the Holy Communion "dwell in Christ" and He in them; or that they all "have eternal life;" or that all are excluded from eternal life who die without this Sacrament. Yet these statements are distinctly made with reference to the Flesh and Blood of Christ (verses 56, 54, 53). If then the Eucharist is alone in view, the "feeding" cannot be the oral manducation which is common to all communicants: it can only be understood of the spiritual process by which the Body and Blood of Our Lord are received by those who communicate worthily. Such is also the natural inference to be drawn from Our Lord's own brief explanation of the discourse: "the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." Such is, moreover, the view taken by S. Augustine and others of the most eminent Fathers of the Early Church¹. (2) Even supposing that the external reception of the Eucharist were intended, it would not follow that Our Lord meant to teach the dogma of Transubstantiation. No passage is of any service to the Romanists which simply speaks of the

¹ For a thorough examination of S. John vi. see Waterland, *Doctrine of the Eucharist*, ch. VI. VII., Bp. Turton's *Answer to Dr Wiseman*, and Faber (G. S.) *On the Doctrine of Transubstantiation*.

consecrated elements as the *Flesh* and *Blood* of Christ. That they are such we do not deny. That they are such by Transubstantiation the bare names will never prove.

(c) *S. Paul's account of the Institution* (1 Cor. xi. 23—34) furnishes the last Scriptural argument. The unworthy receiver, he says, is "guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord" (v. 27); his sin consists in "not discerning the Lord's Body" (v. 29), *i. e.* in not distinguishing it in use (μὴ διακρίνων) from common food (cf. verses 20, 21). It is pleaded that these words presuppose a change of substance in the consecrated Bread and Wine. But happily S. Paul has provided an explanation of his own language in the foregoing chapter. In ch. x. 16, he calls the Eucharistic Bread and Cup "the Communion" [κοινωνία], or joint participation of the Body and Blood of Christ. That is, they are "the divinely appointed means for communicating His Body and Blood¹." To treat them as common food is therefore to offend against That Which they both symbolize and convey; and whilst he who partakes of them in faith partakes (μετέχει, 1 Cor. x. 17) of the Atoning Sacrifice to his soul's health, the unworthy receiver, on the other hand, is counted guilty (ἐνοχος ἔσται) of crucifying afresh the Son of God. He is not a μέτοχος but an ἐνοχος²—a partaker, not in the Sacrificial Feast, but in the crime of those by whose guilty hands the Victim was sacrificed and slain. Interpret S. Paul thus by the light which he has himself thrown, and his words cease to yield any help to the advocates of Transubstantiation.

But if the passages quoted by Roman Catholic apologists fail to make good their position, there are

¹ Wordsworth, *Commentary, in loc.*

² Wordsworth, *ibid.*

other expressions in Holy Scripture which seem to be wholly irreconcilable with it. Transubstantiation, if true, would stultify S. Paul's words in 1 Cor. x. 16, for "then it would be much as if he should have said, The Blood of Christ is the communion of the Blood of Christ, and the Body of Christ is the communion of the Body of Christ; and so the Body of Christ must be the communion of Itself—which is impossible¹." Again, our Lord distinctly calls the contents of the *consecrated* chalice, "this fruit of the vine" (S. Matt. xxvi. 29). S. Paul speaks of the Sacrament of the Body as "bread" (1 Cor. xi. 27, 28). On the Roman hypothesis it is impossible to account for these facts in any plain and unartificial way².

5. **Argument from Antiquity.** The Council of Trent has made itself responsible for the statement that "Transubstantiation hath ever been a firm belief in the Church of God." It professes to be simply the exponent of the "universal sense of the Church." On this assumption it rests the whole burden of proof. Thus, upon the Council's own showing, the question resolves itself into the historical inquiry, Has this doctrine been held in the Catholic Church "*always, everywhere, and by all?*"

The documentary evidence from the writings of the early Fathers is of great length, and a mere selection must suffice. It will be enough to show that whatever view they held, it was not the view which Rome holds now.

It is granted that they freely call the Sacramental Bread and Wine the Body and Blood of Christ. As yet there was no fear of misconstruction in the use of

¹ Bp Beveridge, *On Article XXVIII.*

² See the explanation attempted by the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, pt. II. c. iv. q. xxxviii.

the phraseology which the Lord Himself had employed; no need to guard by definitions this part of the deposit of the Faith. It is also granted that on many occasions their language exceeds the simple declaration of Christ, wandering into the region of metaphors, which if pressed to their literal meaning would imply not Transubstantiation only, but Transaccidentation itself. *E. g. S. Ignatius* (or the writer who bears his name and whose testimony belongs at the latest to the middle of the second century) declaims against certain *Docetic* heretics, for abstaining from the Eucharist "because they do not confess that the Eucharist is the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ,—[that flesh] which suffered for our sins and which the FATHER of His goodness raised up¹." *Justin Martyr* writes even to a heathen emperor, "We take not these [elements] as common bread and common drink; but in like manner as JESUS Christ our Saviour was made Flesh by the word of God and took flesh and blood for our salvation, so also we have been taught that the food which has been Eucharistically blessed [*τὴν... εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφὴν*]...is the flesh and blood of that same Incarnate JESUS²." *S. Irenæus*, the disciple of S. Polycarp, who had been a disciple of S. John, asks those who denied the resurrection, "how they can say that the flesh goes to corruption and does not partake of life, fed as it is upon the Body and Blood of the Lord³." *Tertullian*, at the beginning of the next century charges Christians who were guilty of idolatry with a sin greater than that of the Jews who crucified our Lord: "the Jews laid violent hands on Him but once; these assault His Body every day⁴." "Our flesh," he says again, "is fed with the Body and Blood

¹ S. Ignat. *ad Smyrn.* vi.

² *Apol.* i. 98.

³ S. Iren. iv. 18.

⁴ *De Idolatr.* § 8.

of Christ, that the soul may be sated with God¹.” Two centuries later, *S. Chrysostom* uses language which exceeds the utmost requirements of Rome. The Christian priesthood, he says, is in dignity and glory far beyond the Levitical. “For when you behold the Lord lying sacrificed and the priest standing by the Offering and praying, and all dyed with the crimson of that Precious Blood, can you imagine yourself to be yet amongst men and upon earth? are you not carried straight up to heaven, and, divesting your soul of every carnal thought, gaze with the naked eye of pure spirit and intellect [γυμνῇ τῇ ψυχῇ καὶ τῷ νῷ καθαρῷ] on the things that are in heaven?” “O marvel! O the loving-kindness of God to men! He who sits above with the FATHER is in that hour held in the hands of all².”

From these extracts it is sufficiently plain that Christian writers of the first four centuries were agreed in considering the Eucharistic Bread and Wine to have been *in some true and peculiar sense* changed into our Lord's Body and Blood³. They held a μεταβολή, a μεταστοιχείωσις. But the question remains, Was it a change of substance? or only of relation and use? Our answer shall be given in their own words.

“The terrestrial bread, when it receives the invocation of God, is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two things, an earthly and a

¹ *De Res. Carn.* § 8.

² *De Sacerdot.* III. 4.

³ Bp Jer. Taylor cautions English Churchmen “that they be not abused by the rhetorical words and high expressions alleged out of the Fathers, calling the Sacrament the Body or the Flesh of Christ. For we all believe it is so, and rejoice in it. But the question is, after what manner it is so—whether after the manner of the flesh, or after the manner of spiritual grace and sacramental consequence.”—*Dissuasive*, I. § 5.

heavenly" (*S. Irenæus*¹). "Christ is our Bread; for Christ is life, and so is bread. Moreover His Body is understood [*censetur*] in bread,—'This is My Body².'" "Bread, by which He *represents* His own Body³" (*Tertullian*). "It is not the matter of the bread, but the Word that is said over it which profiteth him who eateth in a manner not unworthy of the Lord. So far with regard to *the typical and symbolical Body*⁴" (*Origen*). "The Blood of Him by Whom we were redeemed and quickened cannot appear to be in the cup when there is in the cup none of the wine, *by which the Blood is exhibited*⁵" (*S. Cyprian*). "Christ delivered to His disciples the *symbols* of the Divine dispensation, directing them to make the *image* of His own Body⁶" (*Eusebius*, the historian). "Let us partake [of the elements] with all assurance as of the Body and Blood of Christ: for *in the type of bread* is given to thee His Body, and in the type of wine His Blood⁷" (*S. Cyril of Jerusalem*). "In the Law there was a shadow: in the Gospel there is the image: in Heaven, the reality. Formerly, a lamb was offered, or a calf: now the victim is Christ. Here He is offered *in an image*; there [*i.e.* in Heaven] in reality⁸" (*S. Ambrose*). "Our Lord has raised His Body to that world from whence He will come to judge quick and dead; He is now sitting there at the Right Hand of God. How then can the bread be His Body, and the cup or what the cup contains, His Blood? My

¹ *S. Iren.* iv. 18. Cf. the answer in our Church Catechism: "How many parts are there, &c.? *Two*; the outward visible sign, and the inward spiritual grace."

² *De Orat.* 6.

³ *Adv. Marc.* i. 14. Cf. Bp Kaye's *Tert.* pp. 449—453.

⁴ *Comm. in S. Matt.*

⁵ *Ep.* lxxv.

⁶ *Demonstr. Evang.* viii. i.

⁷ *Mystagog.* iv. § 3.

⁸ *Offic.* i. 48.

brethren, these elements are therefore called Sacraments, because in them one thing is seen, another understood. What you see has a material form: what is understood has a spiritual efficacy¹. “If a precept [of Holy Scripture] seems to require that which is disgraceful or criminal, it is *figurative*. ‘Except ye eat (our Lord says) the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you.’ He seems to require that which is criminal or disgraceful; therefore His language is a figure, bidding us communicate in the Passion of our Lord, and sweetly and to our profit lay up in our memory the thought that His Flesh was crucified and wounded for our sakes².” “We often so express ourselves as to say, when Easter is at hand, ‘To-morrow—or next day—is the Passion of the Lord,’ though His Passion took place so many years ago and certainly cannot be repeated. So too on the Lord’s Day we say, ‘To-day the Lord rose again,’ though such a number of years have passed since His Resurrection....Was not Christ once offered in His own Person? and yet sacramentally He is offered not only every Easter, but every day; and there would be no falsehood in answering an inquirer that He is offered [in this way]. For Sacraments would not be Sacraments at all, unless they had some likeness to the things which they signify. As therefore the Sacrament of Christ’s Body is *after a certain manner* the Body of Christ, and the Sacrament of His Blood the Blood of Christ; so the Sacrament of Faith [Baptism] is Faith³” (*S. Augustine*). “Neither do the mystic symbols, after the consecration, pass out of their proper nature⁴” (*Theodore*). “The Sacraments of Christ’s Body and Blood which we take, are doubtless

¹ S. Augustin. *Serm.* CCLXXII. ² *De doct. Christianâ*, III. c. xvi.

³ *Ep. ad Bonifacium.*

⁴ *Dialog.* II.

a Divine thing whereby we are made partakers of the Divine Nature, and *yet they cease not to have the substance or nature of bread and wine*. Doubtless also the *image and likeness* of Christ's Body and Blood are celebrated in the use of the mysteries. To us therefore it seems abundantly clear, that the self-same thing is to be thought of the Person of Christ our Lord which we profess [to believe]...in regard to this image of Him: that as, by the operation of the Holy Spirit [the elements] pass into a Divine substance, and *yet remain in their own proper nature*; so does that highest Mystery, whose efficacy and virtue they truly represent, remain One Christ, the parts whereof He consists remaining in their proper nature¹" (*Gelasius*, Bishop of Rome).

It is hardly necessary to go further. These extracts will be found upon examination to embody the following propositions:

- (1) That in the consecrated elements there is an earthly part, as well as a heavenly; the earthly part being the matter [*ὑλη*] of the bread and wine.
- (2) That in receiving a new and Divine character they do not lose their proper nature.

¹ *De duab. Christi naturis contra Nestor. et Eutych.* Bp Pearson (*On the Creed*, Art. III.), commenting on this passage, remarks, "Well did the ancient Fathers who opposed this heresy [of Eutyches] make use of the sacramental union between the bread and wine and the Body and Blood of Christ, and thereby showed that the human nature of Christ is no more really converted into the Divinity, and so ceaseth to be the human nature, than the substance of the bread and wine is really converted into the substance of the Body and Blood, and thereby ceaseth to be both bread and wine. From whence it is by the way observable that the Church in those days [century v.] understood no such doctrine as that of Transubstantiation."

- (3) That they represent the Body and Blood of Christ after the manner of types, figures and images¹.
- (4) That they are called His Body and Blood *improperly*, as Baptism might be called Faith; or as a Holy Day is named after the event which it commemorates.

If Transubstantiation be an article of the Faith, each of these four statements is heretical. Yet they are but the echo of Catholic teaching, both in the East and West, for five centuries after Christ.

6. Origin of the Romish Doctrine. If the Church of the first five centuries knew nothing of a change of *substance* in the Blessed Eucharist, how and when did the new doctrine arise? Can the period of its birth and the stages of its growth be defined?

Approximately they can. No great error is born in a day: no remarkable phase of human thought is reached without the concurrence of various causes. It has been shown that the unguarded language of the earliest Christian writers, and the rhetorical flights of later preachers, lend no real support to Transubstantiation. But they were not without their influence in promoting the rise of the dogma. Men who had neither the discrimination of S. Augustine nor the fervent piety of S. Chrysostom learned to use their

¹ The Romanists of course explain such expressions as *τύποι*, *ἀντίτυπα*, *imago*, *figura*, of the species, *i.e.* the accidental form which remains after consecration. Unfortunately this explanation is directly opposed to the judgment of the 2nd Council of Nicæa; which decided (although in the face of opposing facts) that the elements had never been called *imago* by the early Fathers, and that the name of *ἀντίτυπα* belonged to them only *before* consecration. (Labbe, VII. pp. 448-9.)

language without stopping to inquire into its meaning, or appreciating its spirituality. After a while we find the explanatory statements of the earlier Fathers deliberately rejected. Thus at the end of the seventh century *Anastasius* comments upon the words of Institution: "Christ did not say, This is the Antitype of My Body and of My Blood." Sixty years later another step is gained. *John Damascene* boldly asserts, "The Bread and Wine are not the type of the Body and Blood of Christ." Finally, this denial of the primitive view was synodically sanctioned by the second Council of Nicæa (787), which in its zeal for image worship not merely contradicted the statement of the previous Council of Constantinople, that the Eucharist was the only lawful image of Our Lord¹, but ventured to assert that none of the famous Fathers of the Church had ever called the unbloody sacrifice an *image* of His Body.

The Church was now ripening for a theory of the Eucharistic Presence. *Paschasius Radbertus*, monk, and afterwards abbot of Corbie, seems to have been the first to put the new doctrine into shape (831). After consecration, he maintained, it is to be believed that absolutely nothing is present but the Flesh and Blood of Christ; even that selfsame Flesh "which was born of Mary and suffered on the Cross and rose from the tomb²." Still his language falls short of Tridentine requirements; and it has been doubted³ whether he

¹ The Constantinopolitan Synod (754) had declared that "the Eucharist was the only proper image of Christ," "the union of the Divine grace with the material elements typifying that of the Godhead with His human form."—Robertson, *Ch. H.* II. p. 98. Cf. the citation from Pope Gelasius (*supr.*) where the same analogy is drawn.

² *De Sacr. Euchar.* c. III.

³ By Bp Cosin, *Hist. of Transubst.*, and Mr Freeman, *Principles of Divine Service*, II—35.

intended to teach anything more than a Real Spiritual Presence. "Transubstantiation" (in the words of Bp Cosin) "had not yet been attained unto." Even the ambiguous statements of Paschasius were not suffered to pass unchallenged. The ninth and tenth centuries supplied not a few able and learned witnesses for the ancient Catholic doctrine. *Rabanus Maurus*, Archbishop of Mentz, and the greatest scholar of his age¹ (ob. 856), seems to have been the first to dispute the position of Paschasius. "I confess (he says) that I have found in this book, under the name of S. Ambrose, a thing entirely new to me, *viz.* that this Flesh of Christ [*i.e.* the Sacramental Body] is no other than that which was born of Mary²." His own doctrine is thus expressed: "The Lord...willed that these Sacraments be made of the fruits of the earth, that as He Himself, the Invisible God, appeared in visible flesh a mortal man to save mortals; so in like manner He might set forth by the visible material [of the Sacrament] an invisible substance. The Sacrament of this substance is taken from the Table of the Lord, by some to life, and by others to destruction; but the substance (*res*) is unto life to every man who is a partaker of it; for a Sacrament is one thing, the virtue of the Sacrament another: the Sacrament is received by the mouth; the virtue of the Sacrament satisfies the inner man³." About the same time (c. 850) a still more emphatic protest came from the abbey of which Paschasius was head. Charles the Bald, on receiving the Abbot's book, submitted it to the examination of *Ratramnus* (popularly known as *Bertram*), a monk of Corbie, famous for theological learning. Charles had inquired (1) "Whether the Body and Blood of Christ

¹ Bp Cosin, *History*, &c. v. 31.

² *Ep. ad Ægilum*.

³ *De Instit. Cler.* i. c. 31.

which is in the Church received by the mouths of the faithful be such in mystery or in reality ;” (2) “Whether it be the same Body which was born of Mary.” Ratramn answers that though the Body and Blood of Christ are really received by faith in this Sacrament, yet the Bread and Wine are His Body in a figure ; and that, as far as their substance is concerned, they continue the same after consecration that they were before. In the next century (xth) a testimony scarcely less distinct proceeded from the Church of England. The Anglo-Saxon “Paschal Homily,” attributed to Ælfric, Archbishop of York¹, and read in our churches by authority before the Conquest, teaches that “much difference is betwixt the Body in which Christ suffered and the Body which is hallowed to housel. The Body in which Christ suffered was born of the flesh of Mary, with blood, with bones, &c. And His ghostly Body, which we call the Housel, is gathered of many corns, without blood and bone, without limb and without soul...This mystery is a pledge and a figure: Christ’s Body is the truth itself. The pledge we keep mystically until we be come to the Truth itself ; then is the pledge ended.”

In the eleventh century, *Berengarius*, Archdeacon of Angers, reopened the controversy by certain bold and somewhat crude reproductions of Ratramn’s doctrine. He was excommunicated in a Synod held at Rome (1050), and thus for the first time the sanction of the Latin Church was given to the opposite or anti-Catholic view. This now began to grow apace. *Peter Lombard* (1140) ventured to mention a change of *substance*, without presuming however to define the

¹ By Mr Soames, *A.-S. Church*, pp. 227-9. Dean Hook supposes the writer to have been Ælfric of Canterbury. (*Lives*, &c. I. 435.)

precise nature of the change¹. Next came the naming of the new-born theory, an honour which is attributed by some² to *Peter Blesensis*, by others to *Stephen*, Bishop of Augustodunum, both of whom lived as late as the beginning of the twelfth century. It was now an easy matter to proclaim the prevalent belief *de fide*; and this was accordingly done by Pope Innocent III. and the Lateran Council of 1216. The Council of Constance (1415) reasserted the Lateran doctrine against Wicliffe, and the Council of Trent (1551) came to its succour against Luther and the other leaders of the German Reformation.

Thus (to adopt again the weighty words of Bishop Cosin) it appears "that the dogma of Transubstantiation is a novelty...that it was first framed about the middle of the twelfth century; had been confirmed by no ecclesiastical or even Papal decree before the year 1215; after that date was received in parts of the Roman Church and of that alone...until it was accepted by the sacrilegious Council of Constance, and finally at the Council of Trent was by a few Bishops (and those only of the Latin Church and slaves of the Roman See) definitely imposed on all the world under pain of an anathema—which, however, no man has any cause to dread³."

7. **Other Arguments against the Roman doctrine.** Besides the consent of Scripture and antiquity, the Anglican Church has two other grounds of protest against the dogma of Transubstantiation. (1) *It overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament.* A true Sacrament has two parts, an outward sign as well as an inward grace: a material element, and a spiritual gift. But in the Eucharist, according to Rome, after conse-

¹ *Sent.* IV. 10, 11.

² Bp. Cosin (*Hist. Trans.* VII. 17).

³ Bp. Cosin, *ibid.* sub fin.

cration there remains but one part—for the *mere* accidents are certainly not matter, or a part of the Sacrament, but only its species. On this showing therefore the Eucharist is not a Sacrament in the same sense in which Baptism is a Sacrament: for it wants the outward element. (2) *It hath given occasion to many superstitions.* False and mischievous as the dogma is in itself, its practical results are infinitely worse. With the vulgar it almost invariably degenerates into a belief in a *carnal* presence. The adoration which is paid to Christ in the Sacrament is insensibly transferred to the elements: the Eucharistic image of Christ's Body and Blood becomes an idol. Four departures from Christ's institution due to the rise of this dogma are specified in the 28th Article. "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance *reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.*" "*Reservation*" was undoubtedly practised in the early Church, but only for use in emergencies¹. The "*carrying about*" of the Blessed Sacrament seems not to be of earlier date than the fourteenth century: "*elevation*" is first mentioned in the twelfth². With regard to "*adoration*", few English Churchmen who have witnessed the annual procession on the Feast of *Corpus Christi*, or even the ordinary *Salut*, will doubt that although the more intelligent may confine their devotion to the Person of our Lord present in the Sacrament³, the elements (or, if our antagonists will

¹ Bingham, II. p. 802.

² Bp. Forbes, II. 569, 571.

³ In this sense "Eucharistical adoration" is not altogether unknown in the English Church. See Mr Keble's treatise on the subject. The Church herself, however, has most carefully guarded against any idolatrous worship either of the elements or of any Corporal Presence therein. Her language presents a marked contrast to that of Rome.

have it so, the accidents) themselves too often receive the worship of the ignorant. Fine-drawn distinctions are proverbially unintelligible to the vast majority of mankind; and a Church which teaches that "the worship of *latreia* which is due to the true God" may be rendered to "this most holy Sacrament," is responsible to God for the gross idolatry into which such worship is sure to run.

8. **Anglican Doctrine of the Eucharist.** Much uncertainty has been expressed of late with regard to the Eucharistic doctrine of the English Church. Doubtless this is partly owing to her unwillingness to dogmatise on a subject so mysterious. *How* the Bread and Wine pass into their new relations and become to us the Body and Blood of Christ, is a question which neither Scripture nor antiquity decides; and the Church of England is satisfied with rejecting the rash definition of modern Rome. But that in denying the *particular manner*, she does not deny the *fact* of the Eucharistic Gift, seems to be equally clear. The Homily of the *worthy receiving and reverent esteeming of the Sacrament* thus expounds the views of our Reformers: "We must be sure to hold that in the Supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent, but, as the Scripture saith, the Table of the Lord, the Bread and Cup of the Lord, the annunciation of His Death, yea, the Communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord in a marvellous incorporation which by the operation of the Holy Ghost...is through faith wrought in the souls of the faithful, whereby not only their souls live to eternal life, but they surely trust to win their bodies a resurrection to immortality." The same language has been held by the great divines who have been viewed on all hands as the chief ornaments of the English

Church. One citation from the incomparable Hooker is all that can find place here: "Let it therefore be sufficient for me, presenting myself at the Lord's Table, to know what then I receive from Him, without searching or inquiring of the manner how Christ performeth His promise....The very letter of the Word of Christ giveth plain security that these mysteries do as nails fasten us to His very Cross, that by them we draw out, as touching efficacy, force, and virtue, even the Blood of His gored Side....This Bread hath in it more than the substance which our eyes behold, this Cup hallowed with solemn benediction, availeth to the endless life and welfare both of soul and body...What these elements are in themselves it skilleth not; it is enough that to me which take them they are the Body and Blood of Christ; His promise in witness hereof sufficeth, His Word He knoweth which way to accomplish; why should any cogitation possess the mind of a faithful communicant but this, 'O my God, Thou art true; O my soul, Thou art happy¹?'"

§ ii. *Of Communion in both Kinds.*

1. **Grounds of the Tridentine decision.** According to the ruling of the Council of Trent, the Roman Church denies the chalice to all her communicants, clergy as well as laity, excepting only the priest who celebrates. The denial is made to rest on the following grounds: (1) The reception of the Cup is not necessary to salvation; for our Lord has declared, "He that eateth of this Bread shall live for ever" (S. John vi. 58). (2) By the doctrine of *concomitance*² Christ is present whole and entire under each species—His Blood under the species of Bread, His Body

¹ Hooker, *E. P.* v. LXVII.

² *Cat. Council of Trent*, II c. iv. 32.

under the species of Wine; consequently a true, if not complete Sacrament is delivered in either kind.

(3) Communion in both kinds not being essential, the Church has power to decree Communion under one of the species, or under both, as the exigencies of time or place may require.

2. **The denial of the Cup an innovation.** The Council of Trent confesses that "the use of both species has from the beginning of the Christian religion not been unfrequent¹." With more correctness and candour the Council of Constance, which first authorized the change, admits that in the primitive Church this Sacrament was usually received under both kinds². Later Roman Catholic divines have been equally frank. Thus Cardinal *Bona*, though he labours to prove that the Holy Communion was administered under one kind in certain exceptional cases (*e.g.* in sickness, to infants, at sea³), does not hesitate to affirm that at the solemn celebration of the mysteries "the faithful always and in all places, from the very first foundation of the Church to the twelfth century, were used to communicate under the species of Bread and Wine."

From the fulness of these admissions it might have been inferred that the testimony of antiquity on the subject was unusually decisive. And so in fact it is. Thus *Justin Martyr*, describing the Eucharistic rites of the second century, says, "Bread is brought and Wine and water, and the President offers prayers and thanksgivings to the best of his ability, the people expressing their assent by saying the Amen. Then follows the distribution of the elements which have been blessed,

¹ *Sess.* XXI. c. ii.

² *Sess.* XIII.

³ See his arguments stated and reviewed by Bingham, II. 808.

each individual partaking in them; whilst to those who are not present they are sent by the hands of Deacons¹." S. Chrysostom, contrasting the legal dispensation with the Christian, writes, "Then it was unlawful for the people to partake of the priest's portion; but it is not so now; to all One Body is offered *and One Cup*²." But the most striking testimony against the Roman practice is borne by some of the earlier Popes. When the Manichees, amongst other errors, had refused to drink the Eucharistic Cup, Pope Gelasius bade that in future they should "either receive the Sacraments in their entirety, or be excluded from them entirely, because this division of one and the same mystery could not take place without sacrilege³." Pope Leo the Great is even more severe: "With unworthy lips they receive the Body of Christ, but altogether refuse to drink the Blood of our redemption. Such men's sacrilegious dissimulation being discovered, let them be marked and expelled from the fellowship of saints by the authority of the priesthood⁴."

3. **History of the innovation.** During the eleventh and twelfth centuries the Cup was still administered to the laity. In 1095 the Council of Clermont required all who communicated to receive both kinds, unless provision were made to the contrary⁵. *Hugo de S. Victore*, who died in 1140, uses language which, though Roman in its doctrinal tendencies, is inconsistent with modern Roman practice: "Although in either of the two kinds the same is received in its completeness, yet our Lord is received *in both*, to signify that the

¹ *Apolog.* I. 97.

² In 2 Cor. viii. *Hom.* XVIII.

³ *Gelas. ap. Gratian. de Consecrat.* cited by Bingham, II. 809.

⁴ *Serm.* VI. *de Quadrag.*

⁵ Bp Browne, *Articles*, p. 733.

effect of this Sacrament is twofold¹." The change seems to have been gradually brought about in the course of the next hundred years². About the middle of the 13th century Thomas Aquinas³ speaks of the primitive custom as still lingering in a few Churches. Another half century passed and the evil, which had its origin in the ignorance or superstition of individual priests, received the sanction of the Church. On the 14th of June, 1415, the Council of Constance by a formal decree set aside the command of Christ and the usage of the first twelve Christian centuries.

The excessive reverence for the Sacred Elements which accompanied the rise of a belief in Transubstantiation seems to have supplied the motive for the innovation. To avoid the danger of effusion, the Clergy declined to give the Chalice into the hands of the lay people. In some Churches it became usual to steep the Bread in the Wine, and this practice continues in the Greek Church to the present day. The Latin Church preferred the alternative of withholding the Cup altogether. It was a simpler solution of the difficulty, and had the advantage of increasing (though at the expense of the laity) the dignity of the priesthood. In vain the earlier Reformers, Wicliffe and Huss, protested against the abuse: in vain they pointed to ancient usage, to the Words of Christ Himself. Rome had spoken, and could not retract. The Council of Trent answered every argument by pronouncing an anathema against all who should persist in holding fast the practice of Catholic antiquity.

¹ H. de S. V. Vol. III. p. 362 (Migne).

² There is evidence that in England Communion in both kinds prevailed as late as the year 1287.

³ In S. Joann. VI. §. vii.

4. **Argument from Scripture.** On the Roman side it is argued (1) that the Eucharist is described in Scripture simply as the breaking of bread (ἡ κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου, Acts ii. 42 ; xx. 7) ; (2) that S. Paul speaks of “eating the Bread *or* drinking the Cup¹” as if either act were sufficient ; (3) that the Apostles, who “all drank” of the Cup (S. Mark xiv. 23), were priests, and not laymen. Each of these arguments, if it proves anything, proves too much. For (1) if the expression “breaking of bread” implies the non-reception of the other species, it implies also that no wine was consecrated or received by the celebrant. (2) If S. Paul’s words in 1 Cor. xi. 27 are to be construed as a denial of the necessity of communion in both species, they show that in the Apostolic Church either kind was received at pleasure ; which is contrary to all evidence. Moreover, this interpretation is refuted by the context ; for the very next verse runs, “Let him eat of the Bread AND drink of the Cup.” (3) Nor is the position of our opponents at all improved by the fact that all who partook of the Cup at the Institution were priests. The Church of Rome denies the Cup even to her priests when not actually celebrating. The Apostles were certainly not celebrating at the time, and yet received it from the Hands of Christ.

Moreover, it is quite clear that on this occasion the Apostles received not as priests but as disciples. They represented not the sacerdotal order simply, but the Church. In giving to them the Sacrament of His

¹ 1 Cor. xi. 27. ὁς ἂν ἐσθῆ γὰρ τὸν ἄρτον ἢ πλὴν τὸ ποτήριον —not, as our E. V. renders “and drink, &c.” which represents a reading of less authority. At the same time there seems to be no sufficient reason for taxing the Translators of the English Bible with unfairness, as some R. C. writers have done. The *Codex Alexandrinus* reads καὶ.

Blood, the Lord gave it in effect to all His members. Yet from the great majority of Christians the Roman Church has presumed to take it away. Whether the effect of the Sacrament is invalidated by the absence of one of its appointed elements; whether the souls of devout Romanists are thus deprived of some measure of Christ's promised Grace, it is not for us to judge. One thing is certain. The Roman laity do not receive the whole of that which Christ willed and commanded to be received. And, evil as it is in any case to depart from the straight course of obedience, most of all 'there should have been no infringement of Our Lord's commands in an ordinance so grand, so closely appertaining to the mystery of His Passion and of our redemption¹.'

§ iii. *Of Eucharistic Sacrifice.*

1. Roman Doctrine. The doctrine of the Roman Church on this subject springs directly out of her belief in Transubstantiation. Since Christ Our Lord, whole and entire, is substantially present under the species, that which the Priest offers is the identical Sacrifice which was offered on the Cross. Hence, whatever propitiatory value belonged to the one, belongs to the other also. The Sacrifice of the Cross in all its expiative worth is "daily renewed in the Eucharist²."

Thus all valid arguments against Transubstantiation strike at the root of the *Romish* "Sacrifice of the Altar." If Our Lord be not present in substance, neither can He be *substantially* offered in the Eucharist. The subject of Eucharistic Sacrifice, however, is far more complex than the divines of Trent have repre-

¹ S. Cyprian. *Ep.* 63. The letter should be read.

² *Cat. Co. of Trent*, Part II. Ch. iv. 9, lxxiv.

sented it to be, and cannot safely be dismissed without a separate enquiry into the teaching of Scripture and the belief of Catholic antiquity.

2. **Meaning of "Sacrifice."** A mere glance over the pages of an English Bible is enough to show that under the Mosaic dispensation there were several distinct ritual acts which fall under the *genus* of Sacrifice. We meet with such terms as "whole burnt-offering," "peace-offering," "meat-offering," "sin-offering," "trespass-offering," each representing a corresponding Hebrew word. These various rites readily divide themselves into groups which express the several aspects of the ordinance of Sacrifice. The "whole burnt-offering" [עֹלָה] presents the idea of *self-devotion*: the "peace" and "meat-offerings" [שְׁלָם, מִנְחָה] were tributes of *thankfulness*: the "sin" and "trespass-offerings" [חַטָּאת, אֲשָׁם] symbolized the need of *expiation*¹.

Passing to the New Testament we witness the gradual breaking down of the old sacrificial system; yet Sacrifice itself, in its three great phases of self-dedication, thanksgiving, and propitiation, remains. "When He said, 'Sacrifice and offering and burnt-offerings, and offering for sin Thou wouldest not'—of such sort as [*aitwes*] are offered by the Law; then said He, 'Lo, I come, to do Thy will, O God.' He taketh away the first, *that He may establish the second*²." The Gospel then is as truly as the Law a *Sacrificial* dispensation. But what are its sacrifices? (1) The Sacrifice of the Death of Christ once for all offered on the Cross, fulfils the *expiatory* character of the ancient types. It is the one and only propitiatory sacrifice of Christi-

¹ See Dr Barry's Article on Sacrifice in the *Bible Dictionary*.

² Heb. x. 8, 9.

anity. Nothing can be clearer than the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews—"As it is appointed unto men once [*ἅπαξ*] to die...so Christ was once [*ἅπαξ*] offered to bear the sins of many." "There is no more offering for sin¹." (2) But the Sacrifice of Christ does not exhaust the meaning of either the *self-dedicatory* or *eucharistic* offerings. On the other hand, through It the baptized are made priests to God for the special purpose of presenting such sacrifices continually². *Malachi* had foreseen that in the times of the Gospel a peace-offering should be offered to the Name of God in every place³. And the Epistles amply provide for these most real, yet spiritual, oblations. The whole burnt-offering finds its counterpart in the sacrifice of our bodies to the service of God⁴. The thank-offering is continued in "the fruit of lips confessing to His Name⁵," and in the alms of the faithful, which constitute a "sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God⁶."

3. **Is the Eucharist a Sacrifice?** A little thought will show how all these Christian sacrifices gather round the Holy Eucharist, and find in it their expression or highest exemplification. For (1) the Eucharist is a "perpetual memory" of the One Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Cross. That which was actually offered on the Cross is here in figure. The act of sacrifice is represented in "the breaking of the Bread." The Death of the Lord is "shown forth⁷" in this Sacrament; and a feast upon His once sacrificed Body and Blood immediately follows. (2) As the Eucharist is a sacrificial feast, so it has ever attracted to itself the

¹ Heb. ix. 27, 28; x. 18.

³ Mal. i. 11.

⁶ Heb. xiii. 15.

⁷ 1 Cor. xi. 26.

² 1 Pet. ii. 5; Apoc. i. 6.

⁴ Rom. xii. 1.

⁶ Philip. iv. 18.

various acts of spiritual sacrifice¹; almsgiving, thanksgiving, vows of self-consecration. Such sacrifices may indeed be offered "at all times and in all places;" but more especially when the Church commemorates the infinite Sacrifice of the Cross. All the lines of prayer and praise find in the Eucharistic Office their proper *focus*, and culminate in it as the highest opportunity for every possible act of loving, adoring sacrifice.

So far then there is a *a priori* reason for conceding to the Supper of the Lord a sacrificial character. It is the appointed memorial of Our Lord's One Expiation; it is the natural basis of all our own eucharistic offerings.

4. **Teaching of Holy Scripture.** No one can doubt that the Romish doctrine of a "renewed sacrifice" stands in seeming contradiction to the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is pleaded indeed that the antagonism is only apparent: the Epistle excludes all propitiatory sacrifices except the Sacrifice of the Cross; but the Sacrifice of the Mass is identical with that Sacrifice. Yet a closer examination of the writer's argument serves only to show the weakness of this apology. He asserts not only that the One Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Gospel is Christ Himself, but that *this Sacrifice can never be repeated or renewed*; see ch. vii. 27; ix. 25, 26; x. 12. The priests of the Law (*a*) offered sacrifices which could never take away sins, and (*b*) offered them daily: the High Priest of the Gospel (*a*) offered a Sacrifice which cleanses from all sin, and (*b*) offered it once for all. Now it is matter of fact that in the Roman Church "every priest standeth daily ministering and offering *oftentimes* the same sacrifices²;" even if we are not at liberty to complete the verse. And, *so far at least*, her system is a return to the Levitical system and a departure from Christ.

¹ Cf. Bingham, II. p. 752.

² Heb. x. 11.

But, though the Roman Mass is unknown to Scripture, there are traces of the sacrificial character of the Holy Eucharist which the careful reader will not overlook. (a) There is the typical fact recorded in Gen. xiv. 18: "Melchizedek...brought forth bread and wine, and he was *Priest* of the most High God." (b) There is the prophecy of Malachi already quoted which, speaking as it does of a מִנְחָה or thank-offering of flour (cf. Lev. ii. 4—11), and immediately followed by a reference to "the table of the Lord," has been generally regarded by the Church as finding its special fulfilment in this Sacrament. (c) There are the significant words of Institution, τοῦτο ποιεῖτε¹ εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. "Do [*i. e.* keep or celebrate] this for My memorial"—words, which in their collocation and history certainly seem to have a sacrificial aspect, looking backwards to the memorial "Sacrifice of the Lord's Passover," from which the Eucharist took its rise. (d) There is S. Paul's argument against eating things offered in sacrifice to idols (1 Cor. x. 10—21), which hinges on the idea that the Holy Communion, like certain Jewish and heathen banquets, is a Sacrificial Feast². Yet these are at the most but faint

¹ ποιεῖν in the LXX. is frequently used as the equivalent of the sacrificial עָשָׂה : see a long list of passages quoted and carefully classified in the Appendix to the Bishop of Salisbury's *Charge* (1867). In S. Matt. xxvi. 18, we have the expression ποιεῖν τὸ πάσχα=θύειν τὸ π. (S. Mark xiv. 12), and it was probably in reference to this phrase that our Lord said τοῦτο ποιεῖτε. Again, ἀνάμνησις is *perhaps* technical; being the LXX. rendering of זָכָרֹן ("a memorial offering"): Numb. x. 10.

² Heb. xiii. 10 is too ambiguous to be taken as evidence. If θυσιαστήριον be=τράπεζα κυρίου, as it possibly is, it will refer partly to the sacramental representation of the Lord's death, partly to the θυσία αὐτέσθews mentioned in v. 13, and offered more especially at the Eucharistic Celebration.

indications of an underlying vein of thought. And, whilst we do not shrink from recognising the existence of such indications, we are bold to say that there is nothing in Scripture to sanction the prominence into which the sacrificial view of the Eucharist is pressed by the Roman Church. There is everything to condemn the idea of its expiatory worth.

5. **Argument from the Fathers.** When we pass from the Apostles to the generations which more immediately succeeded them, we become conscious of a change in the language employed to describe the Holy Supper. *S. Clement*¹ of Rome, writing from the very verge of the Apostolic age, speaks of "offering the oblations" [τὰς προσφορὰς ἐπιτελεῖσθαι]. *Justin Martyr* (citing Malachi i.) applies it to "the sacrifices [τὰς θυσίας] which JESUS Christ ordained, namely in the Eucharistic rite of the Bread and Cup." From the time of Justin [A.D. 140] "oblation" and "sacrifice" were the ordinary appellations of the Eucharist, and "altar" became a synonym for the Holy Table. All the ancient liturgies bring out into strong relief the sacrificial nature of the rite.

But here again the whole argument turns upon a question of interpretation. In what sense did the Early Church style the Eucharist a Sacrifice? Was it in her judgment an expiatory offering? For if not, her use of sacrificial language makes nothing for the Roman theory; it leaves the point at issue untouched.

Now, upon submitting these expressions of early Christian writers to analysis, we find that three or four distinct ideas underlie their use of the terms "altar," "oblation," "sacrifice." (1) In the first instance they seem to have had reference chiefly if not entirely to the *gifts of bread and wine and other thank-offerings*

¹ *Ad Corinth.* 40.

which were presented by the faithful before the Holy Supper, and out of which the material elements of the Eucharist were subsequently taken. These "oblations" of the fruits of the earth were solemnly offered to God by the celebrant before he proceeded to consecrate¹. Such are evidently the *προσφορὰι* of S. Clement, and it is in allusion to this custom that S. Irenæus writes, "This oblation the Church alone offers pure to the Creator when she offers Him a portion of His own creatures with thanksgiving." (2) To this primary idea there was added almost immediately the view of the Eucharist as the great Christian sacrifice of *prayer and praise*. Hence, in contrast with the Jewish sacrifices, it came to be called "the unbloody sacrifice," the "reasonable sacrifice"² [*θυσία ἀναιμάκτος* *s.* *πνευματικὴ* *s.* *λογικὴ*]. (3) At the same time or a little later the *commemorative aspect* of the Eucharist came into prominence. As the sacramental elements received the names of the *res sacramenti*, and were called "the Body and Blood of Christ," so the sacramental representation of the One Sacrifice was called without scruple "the Sacrifice of Christ." How this view was originally combined with the preceding will be clearly seen from the following words of Justin Martyr, "That prayers and thanksgivings, rendered by worthy persons, are the only perfect and acceptable sacrifices I myself affirm ; for these alone have Christians been taught to offer even in their commemorative-feast of food and drink, in which there is a commemoration made of the Passion which the Son of God suffered³." And again,

¹ See Faber (G. S.), *Difficulties of Romanism*, p. 107. Waterland, *Doctr. of Euch.* Ch. I.

² S. Athenag. *Legat. pro Christian.* S. Cyril. *Hierosol. Mystag.* v.

³ *Dialog.* II.

"The oblation of fine flour, which those who were cleansed from leprosy were required to make, was a type of the bread of the Eucharist which JESUS Christ commanded us to offer in remembrance of the Passion which He suffered for men...so that *at one and the same time we may give thanks to God for having created the world and all things in it for man, and for having delivered us from the evil in which we were born*¹." This idea of a commemorative or rather representative Sacrifice does not seem to have fully developed itself before the time of S. Cyprian. The great but somewhat incautious Bishop of Carthage is perhaps the first to speak of our Lord offering Himself in the Holy Supper, and to ascribe to the Christian priesthood the power of offering Christ. "If JESUS Christ our Lord and God is Himself the High Priest of God the FATHER, and first offered Himself a Sacrifice to the FATHER, and bade that this be done in commemoration of Him; then that priest truly discharges Christ's office who imitates that which Christ did, and offers a true and full sacrifice in the Church to God the FATHER, when he begins the offering in such wise as he sees that Christ offered it before him²." Yet this language, alarming as it may sound to modern ears, unwise as it would be on our own lips after the experience of its abuse, is perfectly consistent with a belief in the merely commemorative and representative character of the Eucharistic sacrifice. "Christians," says S. Augustine, "celebrate the memorial of that completed Sacrifice in the sacred oblation and participation of the Body and Blood of Christ³." S. Chrysostom corrects himself after the mention of Sacrifice—"or rather we keep a memory of the Sacrifice⁴." (4) One more

¹ *Dialog.* § 41. ² *Ep.* lxi. ³ *Contr. Faust.* xx. 18.

⁴ *In Ep. ad Heb.* Hom. xvii.

step led the Early Church to view the Eucharist as an *oblation for all the faithful, living or dead*. Regarding it as a service of "prayer in its most intense and highest form"¹—prayer offered in the presence of the symbols which represent our Lord's Crucified Humanity—she naturally considered the time of celebration to be the most opportune season for remembering before God the wants of the whole Christian body, and for pleading on its behalf the benefits of the Atoning Sacrifice². The Ancient Liturgies abound with these eucharistic oblations of intercession and praise. Nor will any reader of S. Augustine's *Confessions* have forgotten the dying request which Monica addressed to her sons: "Bury this body where you will; I only beg you to remember me at the altar of the Lord, wheresoever you may be³."

In all this there is nothing that approaches, except in outward form, to the doctrine of the Roman Mass. Each of these primitive ideas finds its place in the Anglican Order for Holy Communion. We have the oblation of the elements⁴; we have the sacrifice of prayer and praise⁵; we have the perpetual memory of

¹ Bp. Forbes, II. 611.

² As our Lord in heaven perpetually presents for us His perfect sacrifice (1 S. Joh. ii. 1, 2), so His Church on earth presents it for herself in every act of worship, but more especially at Holy Communion. In neither case is there any repetition of the One Sacrifice; in each the Sacrifice is continually pleaded, and its exhaustless merit drawn forth.

³ *Confess.* IX. II.

⁴ "The Priest shall then *place upon the table* so much Bread and Wine as he shall think sufficient...after which done the Priest shall say...Almighty and everlasting God... We humbly beseech thee most mercifully to accept our alms *and oblations*." The last two words were added in 1662 from the Scotch Prayer-book.

⁵ "O Lord and heavenly FATHER, we thy humble ser-

our Lord's Sacrifice¹, and the commemoration of the living and the dead². One thing we are without,—the offering of the consecrated elements as an expiation for sin. Our priests are not ordained to offer *a material sacrifice*. If we are losers hereby, our loss was shared by the Early Church. The Roman formula of ordination cannot be traced back beyond the tenth century³. *Solitary Masses* are first mentioned in connection with the severe censures by which certain Councils of the ninth century sought to prevent their celebration⁴. Ancient Catholic writers with one voice deny the existence in the Christian Church of any but spiritual and commemorative sacrifices. "Why is it," asks the heathen objector in Minucius Felix⁵, "that Christians have no altars?"... "The sacrifice which God accepts (is the reply) is a good spirit and a pure mind, and a guileless conscience. These are our sacrifices, these our offerings to God." "I offer to Him (says Tertullian⁶) a nobler sacrifice of His own appointment—prayer proceeding from a chaste body, an innocent soul, and a sanctified spirit." "God is not to be pro-

vants, entirely desire Thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," &c.

¹ *Prayer of Consecration*. In 1549 the "sacrifice of praise" formed part of this prayer, and the "memory" was offered in the following truly primitive language: "Wherefore, O Lord and Heavenly Father...we Thy humble servants do celebrate and make now before Thy Divine Majesty with these thy holy gifts, the memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make," &c.

² *Prayer for Church Militant*. In 1549 there was a petition for the entrance of the departed into the perfect bliss of the Resurrection. This was omitted in 1552. The existing commemoration of the dead dates from 1662, and was borrowed from the Scotch Liturgy.

³ Bingham, I. 83.

⁴ Bingham, II. 793.

⁵ *Octav. x. xxxii.*

⁶ *Apol. xxx.*

pitiated by earthly sacrifices, but by spiritual¹.” “We offer (writes Eusebius²) to the Supreme God a sacrifice of praise; we offer the Divine and venerable and sacred Sacrifice; we offer after a new way, according to the spirit of the New Testament, ‘the pure sacrifice;’ ‘the sacrifices of God (we are told) are a broken spirit.’”

Even in the twelfth century, on the eve of the Council which declared Transubstantiation *de fide*, the primitive doctrine was still maintained. It is no less a man than Peter Lombard who has left these words on record: “That which is offered and consecrated by the Priest, is called a sacrifice and oblation because it is a *memorial* and *representation of the true Sacrifice accomplished* on the altar of the Cross. Christ died once upon the Cross and there was sacrificed in Person: Sacramentally He is daily sacrificed, *because in the sacrament there is a remembrance of that which was done but once*³.”

6. **Conclusion.** Thus historically as well as logically the doctrine of Rome upon the Eucharistic Sacrifice is the offspring of her erroneous view of the Eucharistic Presence. Both are perversions of the ancient Catholic faith: both proceed from the darkest of the “dark ages:” both tend to dishonour and degrade this Holy Sacrament. But, as is commonly the case, the child is worse than the parent: Transubstantiation is a mere metaphysical folly when compared with the “blasphemous fables” and “dangerous deceits” of the Roman Mass⁴. No doubt we must be

¹ *Adv. Jud.* v.

² *Dem. Evang.* I.

³ *Sent.* iv. 12.

⁴ The words *Roman mass* are used advisedly, for the mass did not always deserve the censure which under its Roman guise it so fully merits. *Missa* (whence our *mass*) originally imported “nothing more than the dismissal of a

careful not to lose sight of the blessed fact that the Eucharist is a true Feast upon the Once offered Sacrifice, a Rite which at once commemorates and exhibits before God and man the perfected Atonement of our Lord, a Centre for all the praises and thank-offerings, the prayers and intercessions of the Christian Church. But there is yet greater need of caution lest we suffer the Eucharist to usurp in any measure the place of "the full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation, and Satisfaction which our Lord Himself has offered for the sins of the whole world." The warning which has descended to us from the Reformation-era is not without its importance for ourselves: "We must take heed lest of the memory the Holy Supper be made [in the stricter sense] a sacrifice; lest of a communion it be made a private eating; lest of two parts we have but one; lest applying it for the dead we lose the fruit that be alive¹."

Church assembly :'' (*ite, missa est*). The Catechumens withdrew after the prayers and reading of Scripture; the faithful after the Holy Communion. Hence these two parts of the Service came to be called respectively *missa catechumenorum* and *missa fidelium*. In the next place, the defining genitives were dropped, and either part was called simply *missa*. At length the term was confined to the Holy Communion, and so answered in the Latin Church to the Greek *λειτουργία*. S. Ambrose is said to be "the earliest writer now extant who mentions the mass in that emphatical sense" (Bingham, II. 569; Waterland, *Doctr. of the Eucharist*, c. i.). Thus in the patristic writings, (1) *missa* often includes the whole of Divine Service, or signifies either half indifferently; (2) when applied to the Eucharist it carries along with it no notion of a propitiatory sacrifice.

¹ *Homily concerning the Sacrament*. From the wording of the Article ["sacrifices of masses," "it was commonly said"] it has been supposed that the English Church condemns the practical errors of the Roman system, rather than its theory of Sacrifice. Cf. Tract. xc. (*ed. Pusey*), p. 61. Palmer, *On the Church*, II. 347; the statement is of course

reproduced in the anonymous *Kiss of Peace* (pp. 33—37). But it is hard to see the point of the distinction, if the abstract doctrine of “the Sacrifice of the Mass” necessarily leads to “sacrifices of masses;” if, again, the priests of Rome are not only “commonly said,” but said (in effect) even by the Council of Trent, “to offer Christ for the quick and dead” (cf. Sess. xxii. Ch. ii. and Canon iii).

The following extract from Dr Wordsworth *On the Church* (p. 87) well sums up the points of difference between our “Order of Holy Communion” and the Roman Mass. “The Church of England has *all* the Sacrifice which the Catholic Church has, and she dares not have more...She has a *sacrificium primitivum* [*i.e.* of *primitiæ*, or first-fruits]...a *sacrificium eucharisticum* [*i.e.* of praise and thanksgiving]...a *sacrificium votivum* [*i.e.* of our own souls and bodies]...a *sacrificium commemorativum*, *representativum*, *impetrativum*, *applicativum* [in which the Sacrifice of our Lord is commemorated, exhibited, pleaded, and applied]....But she has no *sacrificium defectivum*, in which the Cup is denied to the lay communicant; nor, on the other hand, has she a *sacrificium suppletivum* to make up for any supposed defects in the One great Sacrifice offered once for all upon the Cross.”

CHAPTER X.

OF PENANCE.

CHURCH OF ROME.

"If any one saith that in the Catholic Church, Penance is not truly and properly a Sacrament, instituted by Christ Our Lord for reconciling the faithful unto God, as often as they fall into sin after baptism, let him be anathema."

"If any one denieth that for the entire and perfect remission of sins there are required three acts in the penitent which are as it were the matter of the sacrament of Penance, to wit, contrition, confession, and satisfaction, which are called the three parts of Penance...let him be anathema."

"If any one denieth either that Sacramental Confession was instituted or is necessary to salvation of divine right; or saith that the manner of confessing secretly to a priest alone which the Church hath ever observed from the beginning and doth observe, is alien from the institution and com-

CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

"Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, ...Penance, etc. are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles."—Article XXII.

"Almighty God . . . hath given power and commandment to His ministers to declare and pronounce to His people, being penitent, the Absolution and Remission of their sins."—Order for Daily Prayer.

"If there be any of you who ...cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort and counsel, let him come to me or to some other discreet and learned minister of God's Word and open his grief."—Order of Holy Communion.

"Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with

mand of Christ and is a human invention: let him be anathema."

"If any one saith that the sacramental absolution of the priest is not a judicial act, but a bare ministry of pronouncing and declaring sins to be forgiven to him who confesses...let him be anathema."

"If any saith that the satisfactions by which penitents redeem their sins through JESUS Christ are not a worship of God, but traditions of men which obscure the doctrine of grace, and the true worship of God and the benefit itself of the death of Christ: let him be anathema."—*Co. of Trent, Sess. XIV. Can. i. iv. vi. ix. xiv.*

any weighty matter. After which confession the Priest shall absolve him if he humbly and heartily desire it."—*Order for the Visitation of the Sick.*

"Our Lord JESUS Christ...hath left power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him."—*Ibid.*

"Whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven."—*Ordering of Priests.*

1. Meaning of "Penance." The word "Penance" is but a contracted form of "penitence," *pœnitentia*, the Latin equivalent of *μετάνοια*, ("change of mind.") Thus for *μετανοείτε* (S. Matt. iii. 2) the Vulgate gives "Pœnitentiam agite," and the R. C. English Bibles, preserving the Latin idiom to the detriment of the sense, render the verb, here and elsewhere in the New Testament, "Do penance." Yet no one can suppose that S. John Baptist intended to prescribe to his hearers a Sacrament of the Church, or that his words convey anything more than what is expressed in the authorized English Version, "Repent ye¹."

"Penance," then, in its simplest use, is synonymous

¹ See this frankly acknowledged by the Council of Trent, Sess. XIV. c. i. Yet such passages are frequently made to bear the burden of proving the "Romish doctrine concerning Penance."

with *repentance*. But at an early period it acquired in the Latin Fathers the technical sense of *public discipline imposed by the Church upon offending members*. In this sense the word occurs twice in the Book of Common Prayer. At the opening of the annual "Commination," the Priest is directed to remind the people that in the Primitive Church there was "a godly discipline," (the restoration of which is much to be wished) "that at the beginning of Lent such persons as stood convicted of notorious sin were put to open *penance*¹." So the thirty-third Article insists that an excommunicated person "ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful as an Heathen and Publican, until he be openly reconciled by *penance*." From these extracts it is plain that the Anglican Church neither condemns the primitive use of penance, technically so called, nor refuses to it a place in her own system.

The Penance, then, which she rejects, is of that particular kind which is adopted by the Church of Rome. Roman "Penance" is (1) displaced from its position among the Sacraments of the Gospel, (2) defined to be a "corrupt following of the Apostles."

2. **Nature of Roman Penance.** The so-called Sacrament of Penance is a heterogeneous compound made up partly of certain acts on the part of the penitent, partly of an act external to him. On the penitent's side, three things are "required for the integrity of the Sacrament," viz. : *contrition*, *confession*, and *satisfaction*. On the side of the Church there follows the sentence of *absolution*. The first three acts compose the *matter* of the Sacrament : the absolving words

¹ In the second part of the same address "worthy fruits of penance" are simply "fruits meet for repentance." (S. Matt. i. i. 8.)

constitute its *form*, whilst *the thing signified* is reconciliation with God, *i.e.* restoration to baptismal grace forfeited by sin¹.

3. **Roman Penance not a true Sacrament.** It is difficult to understand by what process of thought this ordinance came to be placed in the same category with Baptism and the Holy Eucharist, or even how it received the name of *Sacrament* at all. To take the simplest and broadest definition of the word in its later use, a Sacrament must have an outward and visible sign of some inward and spiritual grace. According to the Catechism of the Council of Trent, the sign consists of two things, the element and the word, or (as they are technically called) the *matter* and the *form*. Neither the word without the element, nor the element without the word, constitutes a true Sacrament. "The word is joined to the element (writes S. Augustine²), and a Sacrament is formed." Where then is the "element" in Penance? The Council answers that is represented by the contrition, confession, and satisfaction of the penitent. These form the *quasi-materia* of the Sacrament. But they are manifestly "not matter of such sort as may be applied externally³." Penance has no outward "element," such as Baptism and the Eucharist have, or such as Extreme Unction claims; nor even any fixed outward act like Confirmation, Order, and Matrimony. It is therefore excluded from the number of Sacraments by the definition of S. Augustine, nay, by the language of the Tridentine fathers themselves. If an *element* is essential to a Sacrament, Penance is not a Sacrament, for it has none.

¹ *Co. of Trent*, Sess. XIV. c. iii.

² *In S. Joann. Tract. LXXX.*

³ *Cat. Co. Trent*, pt. II. c. v., q. 13.

Further, though Absolution is doubtless an ordinance of Christ, contrition, confession, and satisfaction form no part of His ordinance. They may be *conditions* of worthy reception ; they are plainly not more truly or properly *parts* of Absolution, than repentance and faith are parts of Baptism. To convert the conditions into the matter of a Sacrament, betrays either a lamentable confusion of thought, or the desperation which attends a sinking cause.

4. **Roman Penance** “a corrupt following of the **Apostles.**” But further, Penance in its Tridentine form is not only no Sacrament ; it is a perversion of Apostolic usage. To make this clear it will be necessary to dissolve the ordinance into its component parts, and to compare each of these with the witness of Scripture, and the practice of the Early Church.

(1) *Contrition* is defined by the Council of Trent to be “a sorrow of mind and a detestation for the sin committed, with a purpose of not sinning for the future.” It is “united with confidence in the Divine mercy,” and is “perfect” when coupled “with charity,” *i. e.* the love of God. So far, few will deny that the Council speaks the language of Holy Scripture. It proceeds however to suggest that an imperfect form of contrition, which it calls *attrition*, and which consists chiefly of sorrow proceeding from the fear of punishment, may be accepted in lieu of contrition, provided it be crowned by the Sacrament of penance¹: a statement which seems to commit the Council to the belief that the absolution of the Church can in certain cases dispense with the necessity of the love of God. So far as this impression is correct, it may safely be contended that the teaching of Rome on

¹ Sess. XIV. c. iv.

the subject of contrition diverges from that of the Apostles of Christ¹.

(2) *Confession*. The confession of sins in all cases to God, and to man when committed against our neighbour, is on both sides admitted to be an essential preliminary to Absolution. The Apostles taught both kinds of confession: "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins" (1 S. John i. 9). "Confess your faults one to another" (S. James v. 16)². The English Church practises both, commencing her daily Morning and Evening Prayer with a form of "General Confession," and exhorting her Communicants before they approach the Holy Table to "confess themselves" individually "to Almighty God," and "if they shall perceive their offences to be such as are... also against their neighbours, to reconcile themselves unto them."

But neither of these kinds of confession is that

¹ Bp. Jeremy Taylor (*Dissuasive from Popery*, pt. I. c. II.) puts this error in a startling form. "As contrition without their ritual and sacramental confession will not reconcile us to God: so attrition (as they call it), or contrition imperfect, together with their Sacrament, will reconcile the sinner. Contrition without it will not; attrition with it will reconcile us; and therefore by this doctrine which is expressly decreed at Trent there is no necessity of contrition at all, and attrition is as good to all intents and purposes of pardon; and a little repentance will prevail as well as the greatest, the imperfect as well as the perfect."

² On the use of this text by the Romanists, see the *Homily of Repentance*, pt. 2. "Whereas the adversaries go about to wrest this place for to maintain their auricular confession withal, they are greatly deceived themselves, and do shamefully deceive others. For if this text ought to be understood of auricular confession, then the *priests are as much bound to confess themselves unto the lay people as the lay people are bound to confess themselves to them*." The text was expounded by the Fathers simply of *mutual* confession; see Bingham, II. p. 1070.

which the Roman Church intends when she speaks of Confession as a necessary part of the "Sacrament of Penance." *Sacramental Confession* is "secret;" and it is addressed, not to the ear of God, nor to an injured neighbour, but to a priest. To deny that this "auricular" confession is NECESSARY TO SALVATION *jure divino* is to incur the anathema of Rome¹.

Now the Church of England does practically deny the *necessity* of such confession; for she neither requires it of her members, nor provides for its ordinary discharge. In fact there are two cases and two only in which she recommends its adoption. The first is that of a candidate for Holy Communion, who is unable to quiet his own conscience by the regular means of confession to God and restitution to his neighbour². The second is that of a sick person who feels his conscience troubled with some weighty matter³. The nature of these cases seems to shew that the English Church regards private confession as a special remedy for exceptional disorders of the soul, rather than as its ordinary medicine. At any rate the very specifying of particular cases in which confessions may be made,

¹ The Roman Church follows up her doctrine of the *necessity* of confession with directions as to the extent to which sins are to be confessed. "All mortal sins must be laid open to the priest," even such as are "buried in the darkest secrecy;" together with all aggravating or extenuating circumstances. To aid the penitent in making his disclosures, confessors are directed to "examine into the nature of sins." In this delicate duty they are assisted by a manual of questions, drawn up by Liguori (now a Roman saint), and sanctioned by Papal approval. Happily for the morality of the masses, the book is disguised in a Latin dress. It is difficult to decide whether the purity of priest or of penitent is likely to suffer most severely by this method of treatment.

² See the 1st *Exhortation to H. C.*

³ *Visitation of the Sick.*

proves that she does not hold private confession to be binding upon all, or essential for any.

The question therefore resolves itself into this, Does Holy Scripture, do the Fathers of the Early Church as the exponents of Scripture, teach that private confession is either necessary or expedient for all Christians?

With regard to Scripture, there is obviously no direction upon the subject. A supposed analogy presented by the Levitical law¹ is certainly no sufficient basis for such a superstructure. Equally weak is the inference which the Catechism of the Council of Trent attempts to draw from the grant of absolving power which Our Lord undoubtedly made to His Apostles. "Since Our Lord (it argues) gave to priests the power of remitting and retaining sins, it is clear that they were also constituted judges of the matters on which they are to pronounce...hence arises a necessity of the penitent's making known to the priest through confession each and every sin." This reasoning (1) rests upon a particular view of ministerial absolution which we shall have occasion to examine presently: and (2) it is confronted (i) by the absolute silence of the New Testament as to any use of private confession in Apostolic times, and (ii) by the distinct assertion of many of the Fathers that confession to a priest is unnecessary. Thus *S. Chrysostom* urges men to confess their sins on this very ground, that they are not required to disclose their shame to a fellow-creature. "I bid thee not (he says) accuse thyself unto others...confess thy sins before God, confess them before the Judge²." "But thou art ashamed to say that thou hast sinned...Yet why? Do I say, Tell thy

¹ See S. Luke xvii. 14, and the *Cat. Co. of Trent*, pt. v. c. iv. q. 40.

² *In Ep. ad. Hebr.* c. xii. *Hom.* xxxi., Usher, p. 85.

faults to thy fellow-servant who may reproach thee? Nay, but tell them to God, who healeth them¹." "Wherefore art thou ashamed and blushest to confess thy sins? Dost thou tell them to a man, that he may reproach thee? Dost thou confess them to thy fellow-servant that he may make a show of thee? Nay, it is to thy Lord, the kind and merciful One, the Physician, that thou dost discover thy wound²." *S. Augustine* is if possible yet more explicit: "What have I to do with men that they should hear my confession, as if they were ready to heal all my diseases³?" *S. Basil* thus describes his own practice: "I do not make confession with my lips to appear to the world, but inwardly in my heart where no eye sees: I declare my groanings unto Thee alone who seest in secret: for I need not many words to make confession: the groanings of my heart are sufficient for confession, and the lamentations which are sent up to Thee my God from the bottom of my soul⁴." These are not the words of men who held Roman doctrine as to the necessity of auricular confession.

It is true indeed that *confession to the Church* was practised in early times. Of this there were two kinds. *First*, the open penance or process of discipline through which a penitent passed on his way to restoration. This process was technically called *ἐξομολόγησις*, *confessio*⁵. The confession consisted of acts rather than of words: it lasted sometimes for years⁶: it was

¹ *In Psalm LI. Hom. II.*

² *Hom. IV. De Lazaro.*

³ *Confess. X. 3.*

⁴ *In Ps. XXXVII. 8.*

⁵ *Tert. de penit. 9.* A full account of this primitive kind of confession will be found in Bingham, II. bks. xviii.-xix., or in a condensed form in the *Prayer-Book Interleaved*, p. 212.

⁶ Thus *S. Irenæus* mentions one who after her conversion continued during the whole period of her life in "confession," *i. e.* in the condition of a penitent. (*Forbes*, II. I, 7.)

made in the sight of the whole Church, laity as well as clergy. With a strange affectation of ignorance the Tridentine Catechism confuses this public acknowledgment of sin with the private confession which it calls sacramental¹. *Secondly*, there were cases in which the Ancient Church without doubt recommended private confession to a presbyter. Thus Origen advises the opening of the mind to 'some discreet and learned minister of God's Word' for the purpose of receiving ghostly advice or *as a preparatory step to public penance*. "Be circumspect in the choice of him to whom thou shouldest confess thy sin. Try the physician first...and see that he is one who knows how to be weak with him that is weak and to weep with him that weeps...that so at length if he shall say anything...and give thee counsel thou mayest observe and follow it. If he discerns and foresees thy distemper to be such as will need to be declared and cured in the full assembly of the Church...this is to be done with great deliberation and the prudent advice of such a physician²." A little later, about the time of the Decian persecution (c. A.D. 250), and apparently in consequence of charges laid against the Church by the Novatian party, the Bishops seem

¹ Pt. II. c. v., q. 41. Contrast the following: "It is unto them which read and judge without partiality a thing most clear that the ancient ἐξομολόγησις, or Confession...was made openly in the hearing of the whole, both ecclesiastical consistory and assembly." Hooker, *E. P.* iv. 4. § 6. See also *infr.* § 14: "It was not then the faith of God's Church as of the papacy at present (1) that the only remedy for sin after baptism is sacramental penitency; (2) that confession in secret is an essential part thereof &c. . . . No, no; *those opinions have youth in their countenance*; antiquity knew them not, it never thought nor dreamed of them."

² *In Ps.* XXXVII. *Hom.* 2.

to have appointed in each diocese a penitentiary presbyter (ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς μετανοίας πρεσβύτερος)¹, whose office it was to hear the private confessions of those who had lapsed into idolatry and to reserve the more serious cases for public penance, dismissing the rest with some slighter punishment. But even this office—the only one which in primitive times at all corresponded with that of the Roman “Confessor”—was afterwards abrogated by Nectarius of Constantinople² (A.D. 391). It was found more expedient to allow every Christian to exercise his own conscience as to his fitness for Holy Communion. S. Chrysostom, who succeeded to Nectarius, appears to have warmly approved the change, exhorting the faithful “within their own consciences, none being present but God Who seeth all things, to enter into judgment with themselves, and so to draw near to the Holy Table³.”

Thus to the end of the fourth century we have no trace of *Sacramental* confession, nor of a belief in the *necessity* of any private confession whatever⁴. Arch-

¹ Socr. *H. E.* v. 19.

² Sozomen, *H. E.* vii. c. 16. Cf. Homily *Of Repentance*, pt. 2. “It is most evident and plain that this auricular confession hath not his warrant of God’s Word; else it had not been lawful for Nectarius, Bishop of Constantinople, upon a just occasion to have put it down.”

³ *In 1 Cor.* xi. *Hom.* 28.

⁴ “*Leo the Great*, who was Bishop of Rome A.D. 440, is said to have been the first innovator on the penitential discipline of the Church; for he forbade sins which had been confessed to the priest to be published in the Church, deciding that private confession was sufficient for the clearing of the conscience of the offenders. *Theodore*, Archbishop of Canterbury in the seventh century, is said to have been the first who altogether abolished public penance for private sins.” —Bp. Browne, *Articles*, p. 585.

bishop Usher¹ has shown that the latter point was an open question to the middle of the twelfth century, and is so left by Gratian in his collection of Canon Law. The fourth Lateran Council (1215) first erected auricular confession into a compulsory institution, ordaining that "all the faithful of either sex, when come to years of discretion, should by themselves alone faithfully confess all their sins to their own priest at least once in the year²." Thomas Aquinas proceeded to systematize the theory of necessary confession³, and the Council of Trent completed the work by proclaiming to the world that the confession upon which it insists is of divine right, and had been the practice of the Church from the beginning⁴.

The Greek Church, with the Roman, enjoins private confession. The Lutherans require it in a somewhat modified form. The Anglican Church, with her usual adherence to antiquity, leaves it optional with the penitent to confess his private sins before God Alone, or to seek, if his conscience should need such assistance, the further comfort and counsel which may be had by the ministry of God's Holy Word⁵.

¹ *Answer*, p. 105.

² Labbe, *Conc.* XI. p. 171.

³ *S. Theol.* (3^æ p. Suppl.)

⁴ Mr Carter (*Doctr. of Confession*, p. 24) says: "Two facts may be considered to be established, (1) that the original penitential system, the only one known to the Church of the primitive ages, was the public discipline; (2) that private confession was then in frequent use, but only in connection with public discipline, and not as a means of obtaining private absolution."

⁵ "I do not say but that if any do find themselves troubled in conscience they may repair unto their learned curate or pastor, or to some other godly, learned man, and show the trouble and doubt of their conscience to them . . . but it is against the true Christian liberty that any man should be bound to the numbering of his sins."—*Hom. Of Repentance*,

(3) *Absolution*. The following are the words in which the power of absolving was committed to the Apostles by Our Lord. "He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them; whosoever sins ye retain they are retained." (S. John xx. 22, 23.)

There seems to be no valid reason for supposing that this grant was confined to the Apostles. "Since we continue to baptise, to teach, to celebrate the Holy Eucharist by virtue of a commission given to the Apostles primarily, it would be in the last degree inconsistent to deny the Church's power to absolve from sin in His Name¹." At all events the mind of the English Church seems to be sufficiently clear; seeing that she has (1) retained our Lord's words in her form of ordination to the priesthood, (2) provided in her Service-book three direct forms of Absolution, the last couched in the strong indicative form which had been in use before the Reformation.

In short, "we acknowledge most willingly that the principal part of the priests' ministry is exercised in the matter of forgiveness of sins: the question only is of the *manner* how this part of their function

pt. 2. The 113th Canon of 1603 assumes the use of *optional* private confession in the English Church; for it provides for secrecy in such cases, "under pain of irregularity" in the priest to whom the confession is made. The convocation of the Irish Church passed a Canon in 1634 (under the presidency of Archbp. Usher) directing that the afternoon before the administration of Holy Communion a bell should be tolled or other warning given of the Minister's readiness to receive persons who 'had any scruple of conscience or desired the special ministry of Reconciliation.' Such facts are a useful comment on the teaching of the Prayer-book with regard to the use of Confession.

¹ Forbes, II. p. 456.

is executed by them, and of the bounds and limits thereof¹.”

With regard to the *manner*, the ministry of Absolution in the judgment of the early Church embraced (1) the administration of Baptism and the Eucharist, (2) the authoritative preaching of the Gospel, (3) the relaxation of Church censures, (4) the intercession of the Clergy on behalf of penitents². In the first three ways the remission of sins is ministerially dispensed by the Churches of England and Rome alike. It is only with regard to the more direct and formal rite of Absolution that they differ. Even here there is little *verbal* disagreement. One at least of the Anglican “absolutions” is almost identical with the Roman form, as the reader may gather from the following comparison.

RITUALE ROMANUM.
(*De Sacramento Pœnitentiæ.*)

“Our Lord Jesus Christ absolve thee, and I by His authority absolve thee, from every bond of excommunication [suspension]³ and interdict, in so far as I have power, and thou hast need. Finally I absolve thee from thy sins : In the Name &c.”

BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.
(*Visitation of the Sick.*)

“Our Lord Jesus Christ, Who hath left power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great mercy forgive thee thine offences : And by His authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, In the Name &c.

In words there is no substantial difference, unless it be that the Anglican Absolution is the firmer and

¹ Usher, *Answer* &c. p. 109.

² For the proofs of this statement see Bingham, Vol. II. bk. xix. 1.

³ Inserted in the case of clerics.

stronger of the two. The Greek Church, on the other hand, contents itself with a prayer for the pardon of the sinner, or at most with a declaration of God's forgiveness; nor does the sentence, "I absolve thee," appear to have been used in primitive times. Yet as the minister of Baptism says "I baptise thee," meaning "I administer to thee Christ's Baptism," so there seems to be no reason why the minister of Absolution should not speak in his own name when pronouncing God's sentence of remission. Our Reformers therefore retained the Latin form, showing thereby how little disposed they were to quarrel with Rome on a question of words. But under this verbal agreement there lie two serious differences, one of practice, the other of doctrine. (1) By the English Church the individual and indicative form of Absolution is provided only to meet the case of a disordered conscience in the prospect of death. In 1549, indeed, a rubric directed that it should be "used in all private confessions." But this rubric was withdrawn in 1552, and by its withdrawal the Church virtually renounced the *systematic* ministration of private Absolution, its place being supplied by the general absolution which was added at the same revision to the Order for Morning and Evening Prayer. Thus with us public Absolution is the rule, private and particular Absolution the exception. With Rome the reverse holds good. (2) In doctrine the disagreement is yet greater. The Church of England holds that power is given to GOD'S ministers to "*declare and pronounce* to His people, *being penitent*, the Absolution and Remission of their sins." That is, the absolution of a priest is (a) *ministerial*, (b) *conditional*. He is not a judge delivering sentence; but an Ambassador carrying a royal message. His declaration of forgiveness is not final and irreversible; it is valid only

where the eye of God discovers penitence and faith¹. Rome, on the contrary, teaches that the sentence of her priests is *judicial*². Their verdict in effect supercedes the verdict of the individual conscience. It is even believed to supply certain defects of personal repentance³. Finally, the anathema of Trent rests upon all who teach that Absolution is confined to *declaring* and *pronouncing* penitents absolved. The priesthood of the New Law (it is said) excels that of the Old, inasmuch as the latter could but pronounce the leper clean: whereas the priests of the Church "*really* absolve," God through their word effecting the cleansing of the spiritual leprosy⁴.

Holy Scripture lends no support either to the doctrine or to the practice of Rome in this particular. There is not a trace in the New Testament of systematic private Absolution. In a passage which bears upon preparation for Holy Communion (1 Cor. xi. 27—32) the faithful are simply exhorted to examine themselves and amend their lives. The early Church preserves the same ominous silence. In all her elaborate system of discipline, we find no mention of judicial Absolution administered in private and for

¹ "He pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly *repent* and unfeignedly *believe* His holy Gospel."—*Order for Morning and Evening Prayer*.

² On the distinction between *judicial* and *ministerial* absolution, consult Bp. Jer. Taylor (*Dissuasive* &c. pt. II. bk. i. § 11); who shews that the priest "can no more give pardon than he can give repentance;" and "will as certainly find [the sinner] pardoned as find him penitent." Similarly Hooker, (*E. P.* vi. 6, § 4): "doth [the act of Absolution] really take away sin, or but ascertain us of God's most gracious and merciful pardon? The latter of which two is our assertion, the former theirs."

³ Cf. *supr.* p. 180.

⁴ *Cat. of Co. of Trent*, pt. II. c. v. q. xvi.

private sins. Even the "penitentiary presbyter" seems to have been the counsellor, the spiritual director, rather than the absolver of his penitent. The only form of Absolution which is capable of being construed into a judicial sentence ("I absolve thee") is no earlier than the twelfth or thirteenth century : Thomas Aquinas defends it as a novelty. Almost up to the time of Aquinas, the minister of Absolution was content to employ the precatory form, *e. g.* "Almighty God grant thee absolution and remission," and of this form are the absolutions which are found in the ancient liturgy of S. James, and in the rite of private confession prescribed by the present Greek Church¹. In primitive times imposition of hands was commonly given together with the intercession of the clergy on behalf of the penitent : although in the case of a penitent seized with mortal sickness before his public reconciliation to the Church had taken place, a single presbyter—or in the absence of the presbyter even a deacon—was permitted to receive his confession, and to re-admit him to Communion².

But the argument against *judicial* Absolution is not simply an argument *e silentio*. The Roman theory

¹ "Lord God, hear my supplication on behalf of Thy servants, and mercifully forgive them all their faults...for Thou dost enjoin us saying, 'Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven ; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.'"—*Liturgy of S. James* (εὐχὴ τοῦ ἱλασμοῦ). The form provided by the Greek Church runs thus : "O my spiritual child, I, a humble sinner, have no power on earth to remit sins. This GOD Alone can do. Yet by reason of that divine charge which was committed to the Apostles...may God forgive thee both in this world and in that which is to come...GOD forgive thee by the ministry of me a sinner all thy sins...Go in peace, and think no more of the faults which thou hast confessed."—*Prayer Book Interleaved*, p. 214.

² S. Cypr. *Ep.* 13.

clashes with the express teaching both of Scripture and of the Catholic Church, the faithful witness of God's Word. The principle embodied in the question of the Pharisees, "Who can forgive sins but God only?" (S. Mark ii. 7) was evidently allowed by our Lord, with the single reservation that the Divine power of remission belonged on earth to the Incarnate Word. Simon Magus is bidden by the Apostles of Christ to "repent and pray God, if perhaps the thought of his heart may be forgiven." (Acts viii. 22.) S. Paul, describing the office of an "Ambassador of Christ," to whom is given "the ministry of reconciliation," speaks simply of 'praying men in Christ's stead to be reconciled to God.' (2 Cor. v. 18—20.) S. John treats of both confession and Absolution as matters of direct negotiation (through the Intercession of our Lord) between the soul and GOD. "If we confess our sins, HE is faithful and just to forgive us our sins;... If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the FATHER, JESUS Christ the Righteous; and He is the Propitiation for our sins." All Scripture testifies that repentance and faith alone are necessary for the forgiveness of those who sin after Baptism; a doctrine which is hopelessly at variance with a system of judicial priestly Absolution. Lastly, the great teachers of Christian antiquity are herein at one with Scripture and at variance with Rome. Again and again they infer the Deity of our Lord from His power authoritatively to forgive sins¹. Again and again they testify that Christ Alone forgives judicially. "Let no one deceive himself," writes S. Cyprian, "the Lord Alone can show mercy, He Alone can bestow pardon for sins committed against Himself... Let the penitent pray to the Lord... Who Alone

¹ *De laps.* I. p. 129.

has received all judgment from the Father." "To forgive sins," says *S. Ambrose*, "is the office of Christ Alone, Who hath taken away the sin of the world¹." "He Alone can remit sins," writes *S. Clement* of Alexandria, "Who Alone is able to discern disobedience from obedience²." "Who else," exclaims *S. Cyril* of Alexandria, "may free the transgressors of the law from sin, but He who is the Author of the law itself³?" "See," adds *S. Ambrose*, in another place, "it is by the agency of the Holy Spirit that sins are forgiven. Men employ their ministry in the remission of sins, but exercise no kind of power which is theirs by right⁴."

(4) *Satisfaction*. If by Satisfaction the Church of Rome understood either amendment of life or restitution in case of injury inflicted on a fellow-creature, the Church of England would fully agree with her in requiring both. She teaches the necessity of "bringing forth worthy fruits of penance," as well as of "bemoaning our sinful life," and "acknowledging and confessing our offences⁵:" *i. e.*, that *satisfaction* is no less a part of true repentance than *contrition* or *confession*. She requires any of her members who may have been excluded from Holy Communion for evil living to "satisfy" the congregation by an open declaration of his penitence, and to "recompense the parties to whom he hath done wrong⁶." But "satisfaction," in its Tri-

¹ *Ep.* 76 *ad Stud.*

² *Pædagog.* I. 8.

³ *In S. Joann.* XII. 56.

⁴ *De Spiritu Sanct.* III. 19.

⁵ Communion Service.

⁶ "Hereby we do learn what is the satisfaction that God doth require of us, which is, that we cease to do evil, and do good; and if we have done any man wrong, to endeavour ourselves to make him true amends. . . . This was commonly the penance that Christ enjoined sinners, 'Go, and sin no more.'"—*Hom. Of Repentance*, part 2.

dentine sense, is something wholly distinct from this. It is "that compensation by which a man makes some reparation to God for the sins that he has committed¹." Of this (we are told) that there are several degrees: the first and most excellent, and that which alone gives its value to any other satisfaction, being the Atonement of the Cross: the second that which is called "canonical," and consists in the discharge of certain penances imposed by the Church. Voluntary acts of self-mortification, and providential visitations borne with patience and submission, are also of avail to satisfy for sin. Such satisfaction is through the merit of Christ meritorious: it "averts the vengeance of God," removing or lessening the *temporal punishments of sin*, which are not always remitted together with the punishment of eternal death. Lastly, this satisfaction (it is taught) may be made by one member of Christ's body for another: "those who are endued with divine grace may pay for another what is due to God."

It is obvious that this elaborate system rests in *principle* on the Roman doctrine of human merit, which has already been discussed in ch. iii. § 2. Historically, an attempt is made to father it upon the disciplinary system of the Early Church, which consisted of exclusion from Holy Communion and other Church privileges until the offender had passed through certain successive stages of public confession and humiliation. Thus the Tridentine Catechism quotes S. Augustine's words; "Rightly are times of penance appointed by these who preside over the Church, that satisfaction may be made *to the Church* in which the sins themselves are remitted²." Two differences however, and those of primary importance,

¹ *Cat. Co. Trent*, part 2, c. v. 9, lix.—lxxii.

² *Enchirid.* 65.

lie almost on the surface. (1) Primitive penance preceded absolution: the satisfaction which Roman priests prescribe, follows after it. (2) Primitive penance was a satisfaction "to the Church:" the penance which Rome requires is a satisfaction offered to GOD.

As to the practical effect of this modern view of satisfaction, the anathemas of Trent will scarcely avail to keep members of the English Church from exercising their own judgment. And few who know what human nature is will doubt that a theory of meritorious satisfaction, however guarded or qualified, tends to obscure the satisfaction of our Lord, and to erect an edifice of spiritual pride in the room of real humiliation. Not without point is the suggestion of the English Homily *on Repentance*¹, that Judas himself attempted to make a satisfaction for his sin.

Thus the language used by the Church of England with regard to the Roman Sacrament of Penance is amply justified. In every one of its constituent parts it is a "corrupt following of the Apostles." Contrition, Confession, Absolution, Satisfaction—all have their place in Apostolic Christianity. But not one of these appears there in the form now inculcated by Rome. In respect to each she has more or less widely departed from the faith which was "once for all² delivered to the saints."

¹ Part 2.

² τῇ ἀπαξ παραδοθείσῃ (S. Jude 3): admitting therefore of no change or accretion.

CHAPTER XI.

OF CLERICAL CELIBACY.

CHURCH OF ROME.

"If any one saith that clerics constituted in sacred Orders, or Regulars, who have solemnly professed chastity, are able to contract marriage, and that being contracted, it is valid notwithstanding the ecclesiastical law, or vow;... let him be anathema."—Co. of Trent, Sess. xxiv. Can. ix.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

"Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, are not commanded by God's Law, either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage: therefore it is lawful for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness."—Article XXXII.

I. Expediency of Clerical Celibacy. Is Celibacy or Matrimony the more honourable estate? Which tends most generally to the glory of God and the good of souls? Which is most expedient for those who are called to the special self-consecration of Holy Orders?

These are important questions, and there is much to be said on either side. On the one hand, Scripture teaches that "marriage is honourable in all" (Heb. xiii. 4)¹; certain heretical ascetics are condemned for

¹ *ἡ τιμιότης ὁ γάμος ἐν πᾶσιν.* It is immaterial whether we translate "marriage is honourable," or "let marriage be honourable." *ἐν πᾶσιν* is perhaps purposely indefinite—"in all places, times, and persons" (Wordsworth).

“forbidding to marry¹”(1 Tim. iv. 3), as though the act ministered to sin; the union of man and wife is declared to be the expression of a “great mystery,” “signifying unto us the mystical union that is betwixt Christ and His Church².” Moreover, our Blessed Lord Himself “adorned and beautified” this holy estate “with His presence and first miracle that He wrought.” On the other hand, it is not obscurely hinted in the New Testament that marriage, however honourable, is not the highest or ideal state. There is a kind of celibacy espoused “for the kingdom of Heaven’s sake” which is yet more honourable, and “he that is able to receive it” has our Lord’s express sanction for doing so³. There are spiritual advantages peculiar to the celibate; “he that is unmarried careth for the things which belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord: but he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, how he may please his wife⁴.” On the whole, if the Early Church showed a disposition to attach too much importance to celibacy, to honour it for its own sake rather than for the motive which led men to embrace it, it may be questioned whether modern opinion has not run to the opposite extreme. With regard to the Clergy in particular, there is doubtless much to be said in favour of a voluntary abstinence from marriage. “No man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of this life;” and one who is entrusted with “the office and work of a priest in the Church of God” may find him-

¹ “This was done by Marcion and Apelles . . . and before Marcion, by Saturnilus, the scholar of Menander, ‘qui nubere et generare a Satana dicebant esse.’ See Iren. I. 22.”—(Wordsworth.) It “first showed itself in the false asceticism of the Essenes.”—(Ellicott.)

² Marriage Service.

³ S. Matt. xix. 10—12.

⁴ 1 Cor. vii. 33.

self seriously hampered in the discharge of his spiritual warfare by the cares and distractions of domestic life. Yet in some respects the efficiency of a married clergy, it may be urged, must be greater than that of the unmarried. How can an unmarried priest fully sympathize with the sorrows or joys of married life? How can he direct his married parishioners in their domestic perplexities? How can he be their example as well as their teacher in the performance of conjugal and parental duties? And who that has known the working of an English parish can doubt the endless opportunities of good which the wife of a clergyman possesses, or the value of her influence, especially amongst her own sex and with the young?

2. **Its necessity, not its expediency, denied.**

But the question of *expediency*, however interesting, is really irrelevant to the subject. What the Church of Rome asserts, and the Church of England denies, is the *necessity* of clerical celibacy. Is every clergyman free to judge for himself in this matter? or is he bound by the law of God to abstain? Has the Church a right to impose upon the conscience of every Deacon, Priest, and Bishop the duty of perpetual celibacy?

3. **Evidence from Holy Scripture.** This consists chiefly of two particulars, a *fact* and a *precept*. As matter of *fact* we know that S. Peter "was himself a married man" (S. Matt. viii. 14); whilst S. Paul *seems* to assert the same of the majority of the Apostolic body (1 Cor. ix. 5), "Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife (*i. e.* a Christian wife), as well as 'the rest of the Apostles' [οἱ λοιποὶ ἀπόστολοι], and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas¹?"...The *precept*

¹ Eusebius has a short chapter on married Apostles (*H. E.* III. 30), in which he cites S. Clement of Alexandria as maintaining that SS. Peter and Philip and S. Paul himself lived

occurs among the directions given by S. Paul to SS. Timothy and Titus respecting the selection of persons to be ordained bishop, or presbyters¹ and deacons: "A bishop must be...the husband of one wife...one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity. Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well" (1 Tim. iii. 2, 4, 12). In like manner S. Titus (i. 5, 6) is directed to "ordain 'presbyters' in every city, if any be...the husband of one wife, having faithful (*i. e.* believing, Christian) children." This language, of course, need not be imperative: *concessive* it must certainly be. "He speaks not (is S. Chrysostom's comment) as laying down a law, forbidding any to be ordained without the qualification of marriage, but with the view of preventing excess." A priest may be husband of one wife; though he may not have a second. Whether by that limitation S. Paul intended to forbid the ordination of a polygamist or of a digamist, or of a divorced person married a second time, or of one who had married again after baptism, is really not to the point. One marriage before ordination is in any case allowed, and therefore it is certain that "by God's law" Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, are not bound in all cases to a single life².

in holy matrimony. Those who renounce marriage, the historian urges, will have to reject the Apostles also. Tertullian understands the text in the same way (*De Exhort. Castit.*). By some early writers it was differently interpreted, and their view led to the dangerous use of clerical *συνελεύσασται* (*mulieres subintroductæ*), which was prohibited by the great Council of Nicæa.

¹ The terms are synonymous in New Testament use: see Prof. Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 93. Cf. Wordsworth on 1 Tim. iii. 2, "The Presbyters, while the Apostles lived, were *ἐπίσκοποι*."

² As far as the *words* are concerned *μὴς γυναῖκος ἀνὴρ* might mean one who had practised either *contemporaneous*,

4. **Ancient Precedent.** Romanists have often allowed that "the law of celibacy is not of divine but of ecclesiastical institution¹." This is really to concede the whole matter in debate. The Church has no power to decree anything contrary to Scripture ; to prohibit her clergy from exercising a discretion which Scripture allows to all. The law of God in this case overrules the law ecclesiastical: it were easier for the universal Church to have erred in a point of practice than for one tittle of the inspired Word to fail. In matter of fact, however, the ruling of the early Catholic Church is by no means so favourable to Rome as she represents it to be. We have proof that in the earliest ages clergy were allowed to be married. S. Polycarp mentions the wife of one Valens, a presbyter of Philippi². Eusebius speaks of an aged bishop perishing with his wife in time of persecution³. Instances of the kind abound in the history of the first three centuries⁴. Meanwhile, efforts were being made to abridge the liberty of the clergy in this respect ;

or *successive*, polygamy. But as the converse expression in c. v. 9 (χήρα... ἐνὸς ἀνδρὸς γυνή) seems to indicate, the latter is more probably the disqualifying state. A second marriage was looked upon by some of the ancients as *εὐπρεπὴς μοιχεία* (*Athenag.*), and was therefore *at that time* a sufficient reason for rejecting a candidate for the priesthood, since a presbyter must be *ἀνεπίλημπος*. It is not clear, however, that St Paul's rule was intended to be binding on all ages of the Church. From a recently-discovered treatise of *S. Hippolytus* it appears, that during the episcopacy of Callistus (Bishop of Rome, A.D. 218), persons were ordained bishops, priests, and deacons, who had been married twice, and even thrice. (Bp. Ellicott, *Past. Ep.* Dr Wordsworth *in loc.*)

¹ Palmer, *Of the Church*, II. p. 444.

² *Ep. ad Philip.* XI.

³ *H. E.* VI. 42, ὑπεργήρως ἐπίσκοπος... ἄμα τῇ συμβίῳ ἑαυτοῦ φύγων.

⁴ Bingham, II. 151.

and at the Council of Nicæa it was formally proposed to separate all married clergy from their wives. Paphnutius, an Egyptian bishop famed for sanctity, and himself a celibate, succeeded in frustrating the attempt¹: pronouncing it sufficient, "according to ancient custom" to prohibit the contracting of marriage after ordination. Yet even at this comparatively early period so strong was the prejudice against clerical marriages, that about the time of the Nicene Council the Council of Gangra found it needful to anathematize those who refused to receive the Communion from a married priest. A large number of the clergy, however, continued to live in the estate of matrimony, and as late as the fifth century the historian Socrates could count up many bishops who were fathers of families born in wedlock. At length the "Quinisext" or Trullan Council (692) laid down a fixed rule for the Eastern branch of the Church, to which the Greek Communion still adheres². Priests and deacons were allowed to live with wives whom they had married before ordination: bishops, if married, must be separated from their wives. The practice of Western Christendom was more fluctuating. As early as the seventh century, the Roman Church had already absolutely disallowed a married priesthood. The practical difficulties of enforcing this severer rule, and the horrible immoralities which resulted from the prohibition of lawful matrimony³, form a chapter of mediæval history

¹ Cf. a lively account of this scene in Dean Stanley's *Eastern Church*, pp. 197-8.

² "The whole Eastern Church . . . allows, and now almost enjoins, marriage on all its clergy before ordination, without permitting it afterwards."—Stanley, *Eastern Church*, p. 198. Its bishops, however, are celibates, and drawn from monastic life.—Forbes, II. p. 654.

³ See Bp. Forbes, II. pp. 640-648.

at once too long and too painful for insertion here. Pontiffs and prelates continually re-enacted the odious law: Councils denounced suspension or deprivation against those who by its rigour were tempted into sin. In spite of both, vice among the clergy was ever on the increase, and the priesthood were degraded by the very discipline which was meant to raise them to an exceptional sanctity. "The Church of God and the whole clergy (says the Council of Paris in 1429) is held in derision, abomination, and reproach among all nations."

5. **Reasonableness of reform.** So great a scandal loudly called for reformation; and the experience of ages had shown that but one kind of reformation would be permanent. The unnatural and unscriptural restriction on holy matrimony must be taken off. The prohibition was doubtless of long standing, but it had never been decreed by the Universal Church; and "from the beginning it was not so." It had not the sanction of the *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*. Above all, it had not the sanction,—it contradicted the distinct permission,—of Holy Scripture. Our English Reformers were therefore at one in this matter with Luther and Calvin. Without binding the English clergy to a married life, without even asserting the expediency of such a life for ordained men, they laid down the broad principle which set the consciences of the priesthood free from the shackles of a tyrannical constraint. What God's law had not commanded, what the earliest and purest ages had not required, the English Church refused to enjoin. She declined to tempt God by putting a yoke upon the neck of her Clergy, which their fathers had proved themselves unable to bear.

CHAPTER XII.

OF EXTREME UNCTION.

CHURCH OF ROME. 1

"This sacred unction of the Sick was instituted by Christ our Lord as truly and properly a Sacrament of the new Law."

"The thing signified is the grace of the HOLY GHOST, Whose anointing cleanses away sins . . . and raises up and strengthens the soul of the sick person by exciting in him a great confidence in the Divine mercy; whereby the sick being supported bears more easily the inconveniences and pains of his sickness, and more readily resists the temptation of the Devil . . . and at times obtains bodily health when expedient for the welfare of the soul."

"If any one saith that Extreme Unction is not properly a Sacrament . . . does not confer grace, nor remit Sin, nor comfort the sick, but that it has already ceased, as though it were of old only the grace of working cures; let him be anathema."—Co. of Trent, Sess. xiv.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

"Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures; but yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God."—Article XXV.

I. Position of the English Church with regard to Extreme Unction. The Church of England denies to the Unction of the Sick the name of a "Sacrament of the Gospel," *i.e.* a Sacrament in the strict sense of the term (see ch. viii.). It was not instituted, so far as we know, by Christ Himself; in its modern Roman form it is at best a "corrupt following of the Apostles;" it has no promise of spiritual grace. Whether in any shape it was entitled to a place amongst ecclesiastical rites seems to have been a question on which the English Reformers were not at first prepared to pass judgment¹. The first Prayer-book of King Edward VI. retained an Office for anointing the Sick². But the

¹ The progressive steps taken by the Reformers in this matter were three: (1) *The Institution of a Christian Man* (1537), warned the people against deferring the administration of this Sacrament till the approach of death; (2) *The Prayer Book of 1549* substituted, for the elaborate mediæval form of applying the unction to all the organs of the senses, a direction to anoint the sick person, at his desire, upon the forehead or breast only, making the sign of the cross; (3) *The Prayer Book of 1552* omitted the ceremony altogether. In the face of these facts it is hard to see how it can be used by clergy who desire to be loyal to the spirit as well as to the letter of the Church's laws.

² The form ran thus: "As with this visible oil thy body outwardly is anointed; so our Heavenly Father, Almighty God, grant of His infinite goodness that thy soul may be anointed with the Holy Ghost . . . and . . . vouchsafe . . . to restore unto thee thy bodily health and strength to serve Him . . . and . . . we His unworthy ministers and servants humbly beseech the Eternal Majesty . . . to pardon thee all thy sins and offences," &c.

In the Roman ritual the priest, after quoting S. James v. 14, proceeds, "Cure, we beseech Thee, Our Redeemer, by the grace of Thy Holy Spirit the languor of this sick person, and heal his wounds, and forgive his sins . . . and mercifully restore full health within and without." Similarly the Greek *Euchologion*: 'Holy FATHER, Healer of souls and bodies . . . heal this Thy servant of the sickness of soul and body which

second omitted it, and no subsequent revision has effected its restoration. Thus the Church of England, if she has not directly forbidden, has at least since the year 1552 tacitly discouraged the practice: it has no recognised position in her system; it has been ejected from the position which at one time it held.

2. **Scriptures urged by Rome.** It is argued from S. Mark vi. 13, that "the Saviour seems to have given some indication of this unction when He sent His disciples two and two before His face¹." The Sacrament, however, was "first promulgated to the faithful by the Apostle S. James" (ch. v. 14). "Is any sick among you? Let him call for the 'presbyters' of the Church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the Name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins they shall be forgiven him." Here, it is said, is a distinct institution of a sacramental rite, with matter, form, and accompanying grace; even the proper ministers of the rite being specified.

Those who reject Extreme Unction answer that the anointing prescribed by S. James was a channel of bodily healing rather than of spiritual grace, and that it became meaningless when the gifts of healing ceased. In the Church of Rome unction is administered as a preparation for death: recovery of bodily health is held forth as at the most a remotely possible consequence. With S. James, on the contrary, bodily healing is evidently the first object; the forgiveness of sins is in the background; the gift of

encompasses him, and quicken him through the grace of Thy Christ." Each of these prayers, it will be observed, asks for bodily as well as spiritual healing.

¹ *Cat. Council of Trent*, part II. ch. 6.

strength to meet the last Enemy is not in his thoughts at all. In the earlier Apostolic use of unction (S. Mark vi.) this purely physical or miraculous effect of the ceremony is still more apparent; not a hint is dropped of any spiritual result. "They anointed with oil many that were sick, and"—a Romanist would have added 'prepared them for death:' the Evangelist's account is the exact converse—"and healed them." Those who see in such statements the institution of a permanent sacrament of spiritual grace, ought in consistency to retain and invest with a Sacramental character the imposition of hands on the sick, which was not only practised by the Apostles, but distinctly suggested by our Lord, as a means of healing (S. Mark xvi. 18). If the Church, in the exercise of a wise discretion, has judged the latter to have been an ordinance of temporary authority, she is equally at liberty to discontinue the use of the former, experience having long shewn that God is no longer pleased to use it as a vehicle for the healing power which it formerly served to convey¹.

3. **Practice of Antiquity.** Did the Early Church think it right to practise the unction of the sick after the cessation of miraculous gifts? It seems clear that she did not. The silence of the first four centuries on the subject is incomprehensible on the supposition that the sick were habitually anointed; the more so,

¹ The Council of Trent asserts that Unction does still "at times obtain bodily health, when expedient for the welfare of the soul." Failure is to be attributed to defects of faith on the part of the sick or of the minister. The epithet "*extreme*" refers not to the approaching end of the sufferer, but to the fact that this is the *last* of the various unctions administered by the Church...In practice, however, bodily healing is not expected to ensue; nor is unction of the sick administered except when dissolution appears to be imminent.

because unction is repeatedly mentioned as in use at Baptism and Confirmation. Origen and S. Chrysostom quote S. James's words, but for another purpose ; of the "Sacrament" of Unction they say nothing. Pope Innocent I. (A.D. 416) is the earliest Christian writer who refers to the practice. In answer to a request for information, he intimates that it was the custom at Rome for the Bishop to consecrate oil, which might then be applied by the sick person himself or by his friends. He adds that this chrism was "a kind of Sacrament¹." From this period occasional allusions to the rite occur up to the date of the Council of Florence, when it was formally recognized by the Latin Church. The Greeks have practised unction of the sick from a remote antiquity, without however assigning to it the style of a Sacrament.

It is not easy to reconcile this ancient and widespread use of Unction by both East and West with the profound silence upon the subject of the earlier patristic writings. Perhaps after the cessation of miraculous gifts the Apostolic precedent was followed only in rare and obscure instances, until the growing ceremonialism of the post-Nicene ages recalled the expiring rite to life, and grafted upon its original design the new idea of spiritual blessing. But, however the facts are to be explained, it seems clear that the Church of the first three centuries was at one with ourselves (1) in not requiring her sick members to receive unction with a view to their spiritual profit ; (2) in not accounting the unction of the sick, if practised, to be a Sacrament in the same sense as Baptism and the Holy Eucharist.

¹ *Ep. ad Decent.* The *Sacramentary of S. Gregory* (590) contains an office for anointing the sick.

APPENDIX.

A. NOTE ON THE RELATION OF THE ENGLISH ARTICLES TO THE DECREES OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

Throughout this manual the Anglican Articles have been treated as the formal protest of the Church of England against Tridentine doctrine. Historically speaking, indeed, they were such only in part, as the following analysis will shew.

1. *Points Synodically determined at Trent previously to the publication of the 42 Articles* (May, 1553); relating to:

- (a) Scripture and Tradition (1546).
- (b) Original Sin (1546).
- (c) Justification and Good Works (1546).
- (d) Number of the Sacraments (1547).
- (e) Transubstantiation (Oct. 1551).
- (f) Penance (Oct. 1551).
- (g) Extreme Unction (Nov. 1551).

2. *Other Points determined previously to the subscription of the 38 Articles* (Jan.—Feb. 1563); relating to:

- (a) Communion in One kind (July 1562).
- (b) Sacrifice of the Mass (Sept. 1562).

3. *Other Points determined previously to the second subscription of 1571*; relating to:

- (a) Enforced Clerical Celibacy (Nov. 1563).
- (b) Purgatory (Dec. 1563).
- (c) Invocation, Images, Relics, &c. (Dec. 1563).

Since the rough draught of the 42 Articles was prepared early in the summer of 1551 (Hardwick, *History of the Art.* p. 79) it may be doubted whether the Tridentine decrees are *formally and directly* attacked on any but the first four of these points [1. (a), (b), (c), (d)]. Still the Sacramental Articles must have been published with the recent Tridentine decrees on the next three points [1. (e), (f), (g)] full in view. Similarly, the subscription of 1563 was made in the face of the Tridentine decisions of 1562; whilst before the final subscription of 1571, the Council of Trent had completed its work.

The Articles, therefore, *as they have come down to us*, form the standing protest of England against Tridentine doctrine, even though not in every case directed against the decrees of Trent. The *doctrina Romanensium*¹ of Article XXII. (*e.g.*) may have originally meant the floating belief of the Roman Church, not as yet fixed by any Synodical decree. It may possibly condemn certain mediæval superstitions or abuses which the Council of Trent did not sanction, which it even openly disclaimed. But it condemns inclusively the principles from which those abuses sprang, and which the Council of Trent shortly afterwards reasserted and declared to be *de fide*. As subscribed by the Convocation of 1571, the 22nd Article, if it meant anything, must have been an emphatic protest against the then recent decrees of the 25th Session of Trent. As subscribed by ourselves, can it mean less?

¹ Substituted for "Scholasticorum doctrina" in 1562. See Hardwick, p. 89 (note). He remarks that "in several letters of the Reformers, we may observe the interest with which they were watching the contemporary disputation at Trent." Although the decree on Purgatory, &c. had not yet been passed, it must have been distinctly foreseen. The very change from *Scholasticorum* to *Romanensium* seems to indicate the conviction of the Reformers that the doctrines which they condemn were now virtually identified with the Roman party.

B. BP. JEWEL'S CHALLENGE.—CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.

It has been thought well to append these brief summaries, the one authoritative, the other, though of private origin, yet long recognised as a fair representation of the Anglican protest. The reader will not fail to notice how firmly the English champion takes his stand upon Catholic Antiquity, or with how liberal a hand the Papal manifesto adds to the Creeds of the Early Church.

CHALLENGE OF BP. JEWEL,

[*first made at S. Paul's Cross, Nov. 26, 1559: repeated March 31, 1560.*]

"If any learned men of all our adversaries, or if all the learned men that be alive, be able to bring any one sufficient sentence out of any old Catholic Doctor or Father, or out of any old General Council, or out of the Holy Scriptures of God, or any one example of the Primitive Church, whereby it may be clearly and plainly proved,

"That there was any private mass in the whole world at that time for the space of 600 years after Christ; or that there was then any Communion ministered unto the people under one kind; or,

"That the people had their common prayers then in a strange tongue that they understood not; or,

"That the Bishop of Rome was then called an Universal

CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.

[*Imposed A.D. 1564, upon all the beneficed Clergy of the Roman Church.*]

"I, N., believe and profess with a firm faith each and all of the Articles contained in the Creed which the Holy Roman Church adopts—to wit:

"I believe in One God, &c. [here follows the 'Nicene,' (*i. e.* the Constantinopolitan) Creed, as received by the English Church. The Roman form then proceeds],

"I most steadfastly admit and embrace Apostolical and Ecclesiastical Traditions and all other observances and constitutions of the same Church.

I also admit the Sacred Scriptures, according to that sense which our Holy Mother, the Church, has held and does hold, to which it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy

Bishop, or the Head of the Universal Church ; or,

“That the people was then taught to believe that Christ’s Body is really, substantially, corporally, carnally, or naturally in the Sacrament ; or,

“That His Body is or may be in a thousand places at one time ; or,

“That the Priest did then hold up the Sacrament over his head ; or,

“That the People did then fall down and worship it with godly honour ; or,

“That the Sacrament was then, or now ought to be, hanged up under a canopy ; or,

“That in the Sacrament after the words of consecration there remaineth only the accidents and shows, without the substance of bread and wine ; or,

“That the Priest then divided the Sacrament in three parts, and afterwards received himself all alone ; or,

“That whosoever had said the Sacrament is a figure, a pledge, a token, or a remembrance of Christ’s Body had therefore been judged for an heretic ; or,

“That it was lawful then to have 30, 20, 15, 10, or 5 masses said in one Church in one day ; or,

“That Images were then set up in the Churches, to the intent that people might worship them ; or,

“That the lay-people was

Scriptures ; neither will I ever take and interpret them but according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

“I also profess that there are truly and properly seven Sacraments of the New Law, instituted by JESUS Christ, our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not for every one ; to wit, Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony ; and that they confer grace ; and that of these, Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders cannot be reiterated without sacrilege ; and I also receive and admit the received and approved ceremonies of the Catholic Church, used in the solemn administration of all the aforesaid Sacraments.

“I embrace and receive all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the Holy Council of Trent, concerning original sin and justification.

“I profess, likewise, that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead ; and that in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist there are truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord JESUS Christ ; and that a conversion is made of the

then forbidden to read the Word of God in their own tongue—

“If any man alive were able to prove any of these articles by any clear or plain clause or sentence, either of the Scriptures, or of the old Doctors, or of any old General Council, or by any example of the Primitive Church; I promised then that I would give over and subscribe unto him.” Bp. Jewel’s *Works*, I. p. 20 (ed. Parker Society).

whole substance of the bread into the Body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the Blood, which conversion the Catholic Church calls Transubstantiation. I also confess, that under either kind alone, Christ is received whole and entire, and a true sacrament.

“I constantly hold that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls therein detained, are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.

“Likewise that the saints reigning together with Christ, are to be venerated and invoked; and that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be held in veneration.

“I most firmly assert that the images of Christ, of the Mother of God, ever virgin, and also of other saints, are to be had and retained; and that due honour and veneration are to be paid to them.

“I also affirm that the power of indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people.

“I acknowledge the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church for the Mother and Mistress of all Churches; and I promise true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, Successor to S. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ.

“I likewise undoubtedly

receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred Canons and General Councils, and particularly by the Holy Synod of Trent ; at the same time I condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies which the Church has condemned, rejected, and anathematized.

“I, N., do at this present freely profess and sincerely hold this true Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved ; and I promise most constantly to retain and confess the same entire and inviolate with God’s assistance, to the last breath of life. And I will take care, as far as in me lies, that it shall be held, taught and preached by my subordinates, that is to say, by those the care of whom shall appertain to me in virtue of my office. And this I do promise, vow, and swear: so help me God, and these God’s holy Gospels.” (*Bullarium* I, tom. ii. p. 130.)

C. NOTE ON DOCTRINAL DEVELOPMENT.

It has been shewn how distinctly, although insecurely, the Council of Trent takes its stand upon the authority of the primitive Church as the Interpreter of Holy Scripture. The whole question between ourselves and the Council resolves itself into the simple historical enquiry—Did the Early Church hold the distinctive tenets of modern Rome or not?

But the more recent champions of Rome have shifted their ground. It is now said that an appeal to antiquity is insufficient. "The increase and expansion of the Christian Creed... are the necessary attendants on any philosophy or polity which takes possession of the intellect and heart... From the nature of the human mind, time is necessary for the full comprehension and perfection of great ideas¹." This view is supported (1) by the analogy of natural growth. "All change is not corruption; there is a change which... perfects the identity of things. All growth is change. A forest tree in its majesty of spread and stature has perfect identity with the acorn from which it sprang," &c. &c.² (2) The precedent of the early Christian ages is alleged. Was not the Nicene Creed a development of the Apostles' Creed, and the Athanasian of the Nicene?

Now, in the first place, to take up this line of argument is to confess that the old appeal to antiquity has broken down. It is to concede what we Anglicans have so long maintained, that the doctrine of the Roman Church is not coincident with the doctrine of the ancient Catholic Church. Beaten on the open field, the enemy betakes himself to a fortress difficult of access. But in so doing he leaves us masters of the ground for which we have fought.

Nevertheless let us follow him to his retreat. (a) The *analogy of nature* tells as much against the Roman developments as in their favour. What right has Dr. Manning to assume that they find their parallel in the growth of the forest tree? Is it not at least as probable that they are the changes of corruption and decay? (b) The *precedent* alleged is irrelevant. The decisions of early Councils were based uniformly on the authority of Holy Scripture expounded

¹ Newman, *Essay on Development*, Introd. p. 27.

² Manning, *Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost*, p. 223.

by the hermeneutical traditions of the Church. Let it be shewn that Roman developments spring from the same source, and we are ready to accept them as integral parts of the Christian Faith.

That doctrine has been and may yet be developed *from Holy Scripture*, is not denied. "Nor (to use Bp. Butler's words) is it at all incredible that a Book which has been so long in the possession of mankind should yet contain many truths as yet undiscovered¹." All that we deny is the possibility of development *by accretion*; for such in fact is the form in which the theory must be held by Romanists, if it is to be of any real service to their cause. "Our Lord said to His Apostles, 'HE shall teach you the whole truth,' (πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν)...The whole revelation then was completed at the first...And that whole truth the Apostles taught orally and in writing, committing it as the deposit (παρακαταθήκη) to the Bishops whom they left in their places (2 Tim. ii. 2, &c.) and under inspiration of God the HOLY GHOST, embodying it in Holy Scripture...There is this difference between the teaching of the Apostles and that of the Church after them, that what the Apostles taught as the original and Fountain-head, *that* the Church only transmitted²."

D. NOTE ON ANGLICAN ORDERS.

In the failure of other arguments, Romanists are accustomed to attack the validity of Anglican Orders. The succession in the reformed Church of England has been transmitted through Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury; and any defect in his consecration would of course be fatal to our ecclesiastical position. Now defects have been alleged in regard to (a) the fact of Parker's consecration, (b) the episcopal office of his consecrator, (c) the validity of the form by which he was consecrated, (d) the validity of any consecration whatsoever if administered by heretics and schismatics.

As to (a) no one now seriously believes the once famous "Nag's Head" story. Parker and the other Elizabethan Bishops, it was said, were ordained at a London tavern of

¹ Cf. Archbp. Trench's Hulsean Lectures for 1845 (§ viii. *On the future Development of Scripture*).

² Dr Pusey, *Eirenicon*, pp. 84, 85.

that name, by a single bishop, no other ceremony being used but the placing of a Bible on their heads. The tale was not put into circulation until forty years after the event; and it is refuted by the clearest documentary evidence, a duplicate contemporary account of the actual consecration being still in existence, besides other records which leave no room for doubt. (b) It has been said that Barlow, Parker's consecrator, was not himself a Bishop. But (1) Barlow's own consecration is morally certain; (2) three other Bishops took part in the act of consecrating Parker, of whom two had been consecrated by the unreformed ritual, and the third after the Ordinal of Edward VI. Of these undoubtedly Episcopal consecrators each one separately pronounced the consecrating words, whilst all conjointly laid their hands on the head of the new Archbishop. (c) It is further objected that the form of consecration adopted in the reformed Ordinal is invalid. The answer is plain. Neither Scripture nor the Church has prescribed any particular form of words. Every national Church is therefore at liberty to choose its own, provided it retain prayer and imposition of hands. The Roman form was certainly unknown to the Early Church. (d) Lastly, it is a mistake to suppose that schism invalidates Holy Orders. The Catholic Church of S. Augustine's time acknowledged the ordinations of the Donatists. Supposing the Anglican Bishops to have been schismatically consecrated, they were consecrated nevertheless. *Fieri non debet; factum valet.*

Cardinal Wiseman, too wise to be beguiled into the use of arguments so insecure, "laid all aside and took up the ground of jurisdiction. But this objection presupposes the truth of Ultramontanism. The metropolitan See in each country has independent jurisdiction according to the ancient canon. Parker was left in undisputed possession of the See of Canterbury, and his successors have the jurisdiction inherent in that See¹." If this be so, it is the Roman Episcopate in England, not the Anglican Bishops, who have received schismatical consecration; and the English Romanists are reduced to the position of an anti-Catholic sect.

The most important defence of Anglican Ordinations is by a Gallican priest of the last century, Dr. P. F. Le Courayer (*Dissertation sur la Validité des Ordinations des Anglais*). An English translation was published by J. H. Parker (Oxford) in 1844.

¹ Dr Pusey, *Eirenicon*, p. 270, note.

E. LISTS AND INDICES.

i. *Early and Mediæval Writers cited in the foregoing Pages.*

* * The dates, especially dates of birth, are in many cases only *approximate*.

CENTURY.	A. D.
I. S. Clement, Bp. of Rome, <i>ob. circ.</i>	100
S. Ignatius, Bp. of Antioch from.....	70—116
S. Polycarp, Bp. of Smyrna from.....	82?—167
II. Justin Martyr	114—164
S. Melito, Bp. of Sardis, <i>c.</i>	160
S. Irenæus, Bp. of Lyons from.....	117—202
Tertullian	150—220
S. Clement of Alexandria, <i>ob.</i>	216
III. Minucius Felix, <i>fl. c.</i>	230
Origen	184—255
S. Cyprian, Bp. of Carthage from.....	248—258
Firmilian, Bp. of Cæsarea (<i>Cappadocia</i>), <i>ob.</i>	266
IV. Arnobius, <i>ob.</i>	326
Eusebius, Bp. of Cæsarea (<i>Palestine</i>).....	270—340
S. Athanasius, Bp. of Alexandria from...	326—373
S. Hilary, Bp. of Poitiers from	350—367
S. Basil, Bp. of Cæsarea (<i>Capp.</i>) from ...	370—379
S. Cyril, Bp. of Jerusalem	315—386
S. Gregory, Bp. of Nazianzum	328—390
S. Gregory, Bp. of Nyssa	331—395
S. Ambrose, Bp. of Milan from	374—397
S. Epiphanius, Bp. of Constantia (<i>Cyprus</i>)	310—403
S. John Chrysostom, Bp. of Constanti- nople from.....	398—407
S. Jerome	331—420

v.	S. Augustine (born 354, bapt. 387), Bp. of Hippo from	395—430
	S. Innocent, Bp. of Rome from	402—417
	S. Cyril, Bp. of Alexandria from	412—444
	Theodoret, Bp. of Cyrus (<i>Syria</i>) from....	420—457
	Vincentius Lirinensis, <i>ob. c.</i>	450
	S. Leo (the Great), Bp. of Rome from ...	440—461
	S. Gelasius, Bp. of Rome from.....	492—496
vi.	Fulgentius, Bp. of Ruspe from.....	507—533
	Cassiodorus	470—560
	S. Gregory (the Great), Bp. of Rome from	590—604
viii.	S. Bede	673—734
	John Damascene, <i>db. c.</i>	754
ix.	Paschasius Radbert	786—851
	Rabanus Maurus, Archbp. of Mentz from	847—857
	Ratramnus (or Bertram), <i>ob. c.</i>	870
x.	Ælfric [Archbp. of York from	1023—1051]
xi.	S. Anselm, Archbp. of Canterbury from	1093—1109
xii.	Hugo de S. Victore	1096—1140
	S. Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux	1091—1153
	Peter Lombard, Bp. of Paris from	1150—1164
xiii.	Thomas Aquinas.....	1224—1274

ii. *Councils cited.*

* * General or Œcumenical Councils are distinguished
by small capitals.

CENTURY.	A.D.
IV. Eliberis (Spain)	305
Laodicea	320
Gangra	324
NICÆA [ὁμοούσιον]	325
Sardica	347
CONSTANTINOPLE I.	381
Carthage	397
V. Milevis	416
EPHESUS [Θεοτόκος]	431
CHALCEDON	451
VI. CONSTANTINOPLE II.	553
VII. CONSTANTINOPLE III.	680
Constantinople (Quinisext or Trullan) ...	692
Leptines.....	743
VIII. Constantinople	754
Nicæa II. [<i>Image worship</i>]	787
Frankfort	794
XI. Clermont	1095
XIII. Lateran IV. [<i>Transubstantiation</i>]	1215
XV. Constance [<i>Denial of the Cup</i>]	1414—1418
Paris	1429
Basle	1431—1443
Florence [<i>Purgatory</i>]	1439
XVI. Trent	1545—1563

iii. *Index of Scripture Texts more or less fully illustrated.*

	PAGE		PAGE
Genesis xxxii. 29.....	104	Rom. xii. 11.....	103
xlvii. 31.....	112	1 Cor. iii. 10—15.....	78, 167
xlviii. 16.....	104	ix. 5.....	199
Psalms xlv. 14.....	123	x. 16.....	144
lxii. 12.....	41	x. 20, 21.....	167
Malachi i. 11.....	165, 167	xi. 27, 28.....	145
S. Matt. iii. 2.....	177	xiv. 16.....	122
x. 2.....	47	2 Cor. v. 21.....	33
xvi. 18, 19.....	49	Gal. iv. 24.....	142
xxvi. 29.....	145	Col. ii. 18.....	106
S. Luke i. 28.....	103	1 Tim. iii. 2.....	200
xxii. 19.....	167	iii. 15.....	68
S. John xx. 22, 23.....	188	iv. 3.....	198
xxi. 15—17.....	48	Heb. x. 8, 9.....	164
vi. 43—59.....	142	xi. 21.....	112
vi. 58.....	158	xiii. 4.....	197
Acts vii. 59.....	92	xiii. 10.....	167
ix. 14—21.....	92	S. James ii. 11—26.....	37
xix. 11.....	110	v. 14.....	206
Rom. vii. 7.....	21	S. Jude 3.....	196

iv. *Index of Words explained.*

	PAGE		PAGE
Accidents	139	κοινωνία	144
Angelicals.....	105	λατρεία.....	100
Apocrypha	18	Limbus.....	92
ἀνάμνησις	167	Liturgy.....	122
ἀντίτυπα	151	Martyria.....	94
Attrition	180	Mass, missa	173
Autocephalous.....	63	Merit.....	40
Canon.....	14	Metropolitan	56
Catholic	46	μυστήριον.....	132
Church	45	Patriarch.....	56
Collyridiani	101	Penance	177
Concomitance	158	Penitentiary presbyter ..	186
Confessio	184	Peter.....	51
Contrition	180	ποιεῖν	167
Dei Genetrix s. mater... 96		Sacramentum	131
δουλεία	100	Sacrifice	164
εἰκονόδουλοι	117	συνείσακτοι	200
εἰκονομαχία	116	Substance.....	139
ἐξομολόγησις	184	Supererogation	42
ἐπικαλεῖσθαι	92	Θεοτόκος	96
<i>Extreme</i> Unction.....	207	Transubstantiation	139
Faithful.....	46	τύποι	151
Figura	151	θυσία ἀναίμακτος	169
ιδιώτης	122	ὑπερδουλεία	100
Imago	151	Worship.....	101
Indulgence	82		
κεχαριτωμένη.	103		

παρακαλῶν ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ ᾧπαξ παρα-
δοθείᾳ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει.

Cambridge :

PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A.

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

W

280.20M ~~282~~
SW 46 ~~SW 4~~

Write. Henry Barclay, M. A.

~~282~~ 280.20M
~~SW 4~~ SW 46

876177
111928

22368

